JPRS-TAC-86-054

14 JULY 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-054

14 JULY 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: Mid-June Reports on U.S. SDI Debates
(Various sources, various dates)..... 1

Increased Opposition Seen 1
Senate Subcommittee Approves 2
Weinberger Remarks Cited 2
Scientists' Petition Noted 3
Economic Burden Noted 4
Weinberger 'Pressure' on Opponents 5

USSR: June Reports on Allied Consideration of SDI
(Moscow TASS, 24 Jun 86; Moscow in Japanese to Japan,
5 Jun 86) 6

FRG Companies 'Undecided' 6
FRG To Develop Antiballistic Missile 6
UK Signs Contracts With Washington 7
Growing Opposition in Japan 7

Karpov Comments on Space Arms at FRG Colloquium
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 17 Jun 86)..... 9

CPSU's Dobrynin Assails SDI as Destabilizing
(Anatoliy Dobrynin; Bratislava PRAVDA, 20 Jun 86)..... 11

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Soviet General on 'New' Elements in Gorbachev 16 June Proposal
(Mikhail Milshteyn Interview; Moscow in English to North
America, 23 Jun 86)..... 15

USSR: Reports on U.S. Response to Gorbachev 16 June Speech
(Various sources, various dates)..... 17

U.S. Studying Proposals 17
Weinberger Rejects 'Key Elements' 17
U.S. Press, Congressional Response 18
U.S. Pushed to Serious Response 19

USSR: Reagan Responds to Gorbachev Initiative in Glassboro Speech
(Various sources, 21-23 Jun 86)..... 20

TASS Criticizes Speech 20
Change in Stance Noted 21
NEW YORK TIMES Cited 22

USSR's Petrovskiy Addresses CD, Assails U.S. Stance
(Moscow World Service, 24 Jun 86; Paris AFP, 24 Jun 86)..... 23

Critical of U.S. Stand 23
Sees 'Complete' Lack of Progress 23

Soviet Interim Proposal Seeks To Break Geneva 'Standstill'
(Vladimir Chernysev; Moscow TASS International Service,
17 Jun 86)..... 24

TASS Military Commentator Doubts U.S. Commitment
(Moscow TASS, 18 Jun 86)..... 26

Soviet General Volkogonov Discusses Strategic Military Parity
(Dmitriy Volkogonov; Moscow Radio Peace and Progress,
16 Jun 86)..... 29

Soviet General Chervov Comments on SDI, SALT II, SS-20's
(Nikolay Chervov Interview; Rome LA REPUBBLICA, 17 Jun 86)... 31

TASS Cites FRG SPD Leader on SDI, SALT II
(Moscow TASS, 22 Jun 86)..... 33

Moscow 'Top Priority' Panel on SALT II, ABM Treaty, SDI, INF
(Moscow in English to North America, 22 Jun 86)..... 34

XINHUA Calls Soviet Proposal Noteworthy 'Interim Agreement'
(Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 24 Jun 86)..... 38

PRC: U.S.-Soviet Arms Talks End Without Progress
(Beijing XINHUA, 26 Jun 86)..... 40

Beijing Review: Arms Race Seen Still on Grueling Course
(Peng Di; Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, No 25, 23 Jun 86)..... 41

Soviet Chief of Staff on Japanese SDI Role, SS-20's
(Akhromeyev Interview; Tokyo NHK Television Network, 11 Jun 86)..... 43

SALT/START ISSUES

PRC Journal Views U.S.-Soviet Dispute Over SALT II
(Shi Lujia; Beijing LIAOWANG, No 24, 16 Jun 86)..... 45

XINHUA: U.S. Strategic Goal Seeks To Hinder USSR Development
(Mei Zhenmin; Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service, 25 Jun 86)... 48

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Moscow Discusses French Nuclear Arms Before Mitterand's Visit
(Moscow in French to France and Belgium, 13 Jun 86)..... 50

PRAVDA Stresses Importance of British, French Nuclear Arms
(Moscow PRAVDA, 23 Jun 86)..... 52

Moscow on U.S. Deployments in Japan
(Moscow Television Service, 17 Jun 86; Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 20 Jun 86)..... 55

Okinawa Exercise 55
F-16's to Misawa 56

Briefs
TASS on 'Tomahawk' Test 58

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: U.S. Continuing 'Secret' CW Research
(Moscow TASS, 17 Jun 86)..... 59

TASS: U.S. Turning 'Blind Eye' to Leaking Chemical Weapons Depots
(Moscow TASS, 11 Jun 86)..... 60

TASS: Press Conference at USIA Seeks To Justify U.S. CW Buildup
(Moscow TASS, 13 Jun 86)..... 61

Moscow TV Discusses CW Dangers to FRG
(Moscow Television Service, 22 Jun 86)..... 62

IZVESTIYA Notes Spanish TV Show on U.S., UK CBW Research
(V. Vernikov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 16 Apr 86)..... 65

USSR: Chemical Weapons Seminar Sponsored by Dutch Government
(Moscow TASS, 4, 6 Jun 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 6 Jun 86)..... 68

Seminar Opens 68
European Opposition to CW Noted 68
Verification Discussed 69

FRG Agrees With U.S. on Chemical Weapons
(Hamburg DPA, 15 May 86; Hamburg ARD Television Network, 15 May 86)..... 70

Government Defends NATO Vote 70
Woerner Comments 71

FRG Paper Cites NATO Concern About Bonn's Possible Veto Right
(Bonn DIE WELT, 13 May 86)..... 73

FRG Newspaper Comments on NATO CBW Decision
(Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, 23 May 86)..... 74

USSR's Israelyan Speaks on Chemical Weapons
(Various sources, various dates)..... 75

Press Conference at CD 75
In Bonn With Kvitsinskiy 75
British-Soviet Talks 76

Briefs
Security Council Decision 77
U.S. To Withdraw Chemical Weapons 77
FRG Denies Upgrading Chemical Weapons 77

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

BEIJING REVIEW: Warsaw Pact Proposal Timely
(Xin Zong; Beijing BEIJING REVIEW, No 25, 23 Jun 86)..... 78

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. Plans 25 June Nevada Test
(Moscow TASS, 25 Jun 86; Moscow Domestic Service, 24 Jun 86). 80

TASS Report 80
'Staking on Sheer Force' 81

PRAVDA: U.S. Blocking Creation of Southeast Asia NFZ
(Dmitriy Kosyrev; Moscow PRAVDA, 14 Apr 86)..... 82

USSR: North Korea Proposes Nuclear-Free Peninsula
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 24 Jun 86; Moscow World Service, 24, 25 June 86)..... 84

Government Statement Cited 84
U.S. Response Viewed 84
PRC in Favor 85

Briefs
SPD/SED Talks 86

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA on Gorbachev Geneva Proposals, Warsaw Pact Appeal
(Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Jun 86)..... 87

USSR: U.S. Administration Should Heed 'Lessons' of War
(A. Leontyev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 21 Jun 86)..... 90

Soviet Military Paper on U.S. SSBN, Surface Naval Programs
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 14 Jun 86)..... 92

Moscow Commentary on Different Disarmament Approaches
(Moscow Television Service, 17 Jun 86)..... 95

Moscow, China Vow No-First-Use of Nuclear Weapons
(Moscow in Mandarin to China, 14 Jun 86)..... 96

TASS: Carrington Pressures Norway on SDI, Arms Spending, NFZ
(Moscow TASS, 24 Jun 86)..... 98

Soviet Scientists on Nuclear War Effects on Biosphere
(Vladimir Lvov; Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 4 Apr 86).. 99

/6539

JPRS-TAC-86-054
14 July 1986

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: MID-JUNE REPORTS ON U.S. SDI DEBATES

Increased Opposition Seen

PM121501 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 12 Jun 86 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel I. Nikolayev article: "Seeing the Light...? Opposition to the 'Star Wars' Program Growing in the United States"]

[Text] The U.S. Congress has resumed discussion of the draft federal budget for fiscal 1987. The administration's demand for appropriations for implementing the "Strategic Defense Initiative" to be increased 77 percent has aroused a storm of passions both inside and outside Congress. The amounts being demanded for this purpose are truly astronomic -- the Pentagon's budget request for fiscal 1987, confirmed by the President, stands at $5.4 billion.

Such excessive appetites of the military-industrial complex have aroused stubborn resistance even among those who have never before objected to the acceleration of war preparations. In a recent letter to the Senate Armed Services Committee, 46 senators of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties voiced "alarm in connection with the fact that the Defense Department budget provides for inordinate and unjustified appropriations to implement the Strategic Defense Initiative."

One of the most remarkable theses in this letter is the clear admission that "the holding of flight tests within the SDI framework will be a violation of the 1972 ABM Treaty."

Other congressmen have supported the initiative of the group of senators. As C. Bennett, member of the House Armed Services Committee, declared, he not only approves the senator's letter but also intends to set up an analogous group in the House of Representatives to freeze appropriations for SDI.

The U.S. Administration is not all cheered by the prospects of the Senate and the House of Representatives pooling their efforts. The congressmen's actions are regarded as one of the most serious actions against SDI since that program was made public.

Opposition to the "star wars" program is also spreading among American scientists. A majority of the professorial staff in the physics faculties of 20 of the country's leading universities have declared that they do not support SDI and will not accept any funds allocated for research within its framework. These scientists include 15 Nobel Prize winners.

As Prof (Dzh. Kogut) of the University of Illinois declared, more than 6,500 U.S. scientists have signed "an official statement of nonparticipation in SDI." Just 80 scientists in the United States have come our (or, rather, been forced to come out) in favor of research under the "star wars" program. An eloquent ratio, let us state bluntly: more than 80 "cons" for every "pro."

The administration's efforts to justify in the eyes of the public the policy of militarizing space by citing such old and repeatedly exposed "arguments" as White House spokesman L. Speakes uses, for example, appear pitiful. He claims that SDI was "a positive factor which contributed to the start of arms talks."

As increasingly wide public circles recognize the true essence of SDI, their understanding of its aggressive thrust is growing. Under these conditions apologists for "star wars" are finding it increasingly hard to conceal their true intentions of achieving military superiority over the USSR and its allies and trying to resolve the historic dispute between socialism and capitalism by military means.

Senate Subcommittee Approves

LD132149 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, 13 Jun (TASS)--The Senate subcommittee on strategic and theatre nuclear forces voted for $4.1 billion on continued "star wars" preparations in fiscal 1987. In addition to this money, appropriated for the Pentagon to develop components of a large partially space-based ABM system, the Department of Energy, concerned with the development of advanced nuclear weapons, including nuclear-pumped X-ray lasers, will get another $400 million. The administration has thus kept its request for funds virtually intact in the first congressional vote on "star wars" spending next fiscal year.

Weinberger Remarks Cited

LD182220 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1615 GMT 18 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jun (TASS) -- TASS commentator Leonid Ponomarev writes: U.S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger in one of his recent meetings with journalists said that in the framework of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program, 99 percent of efforts are directed at the possibility of destroying Soviet nuclear missiles the moment they are launched. He even assured listeners that the Washington administration is much less interested in "the defense" of its nuclear potential than in the destruction of Soviet missiles "by any means."

This pronouncement by Pentagon's boss bears witness to the fact that U.S. leaders, however much they deny it, direct their strategy at making a first nuclear strike and at the destruction of Soviet missiles on Soviet territory. The whole complex of weapons systems being created within the SDI framework is subjected to this task, more widely known as the "star wars" program.

THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper reports, for example, that at the Livermore laboratory and at its test site in Nevada intensive work is being done to create a ray weapon, for which a nuclear explosion in space close to earth will serve as the source of energy. Such a weapon is being prepared despite the fact that putting into space nuclear means, their siting and explosions in space are prohibited by specific accords. There is no doubt whatsoever that as soon as the United States creates this weapon it will discard the aforementioned accords, just as today it is discarding SALT II, which interferes with the future growth of the U.S. nuclear potential. Even the names of the types of bombs being devised according to the Pentagon's orders indicates that the whole policy, the whole U.S. military strategy is subjected to the idea of a first strike. Here are the names: "Electromagnetic impulse bomb," "an optical laser bomb," "a gamma-ray bomb" and others.

Acknowledged even by American specialists, all the new weapons can be used "for fulfilling an innumerable quantity of tasks" and not only for "defense" as the Washington administration asserts.

In other words the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is a very serious escalation in the arms race. The other side is naturally not going to look on calmly as Washington speeds up the growth of its strike potential.

However now, while there is still time, the Soviet Union proposes to reach an accord with the United States on not departing from the Soviet-U.S. treaty on antimissile defense for at least 15 years, while limiting work in the sphere of SDI to the level of research -- a threshold which the United States has in fact approached. In sofar as the Soviet Union will by no means allow the United States nuclear missile superiority, then the best thing is to try to reach agreement on ending the arms race now and to do so honestly and reliably.

Scientists' Petition Noted

LD192021 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, 19 Jun (TASS)--The development of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), known as the "star wars" program, "represents a significant escalation of the arms race and runs the serious risk of jeopardizing existing arms control treaties and future negotiations," says a letter to President Ronald Reagan, signed by 1,600 American scientists.

The petition was delivered to a news conference in the American capital today, the ASSOCIATED PRESS reported, as a warning to President Reagan who was seeking to expand SDI spending within the brief period.

Last year, for instance, the AP observed, Reagan asked Congress to approve a total of $4.17 billion in government spending on SDI, while this year, he was seeking $5.4 billion.

The news conference was sponsored by Senators Bennett Johnston and Dan Evans, who had put together a coalition of 48 senators opposing further increases in the "star wars" budget.

Daniel Fisher, an organizer of the petition drive, said SDI "has aroused an unprecedented level of concern among the scientific and technical community in this country... yet the administration does not seem to have listened to the very engineers and scientists upon whom President Reagan called to lead the effort to develop a shield against nuclear attack."

Another organizer, John Backus, said that a computer program to operate a "star wars" defense would be "vast, complex and subject to errors."

"I consider it impossible to produce a complete reliable battle program," Backus concluded.

Economic Burden Noted

LD241848 Moscow TASS in English 1820 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS -- by TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Three years and a half following Ronald Reagan's proclamation of the "star wars" programs, the "Christmas wrapping" has fallen off his promise to make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete" with the help of a space-based anti-missile defence system.

The undermining by Washington of the latest strategic arms limitation treaty commitments and the White House's refusal to suspend nuclear testing highlighted the American Administration's attitude to problems of war and peace.

American experts convincingly prove that the large-scale anti-missile defence, currently being developed in the U.S. will at best be an umbrella with a hole in it, that could protect against a drizzle, but not against the missile torrent -- a counter strike at the aggressor.

Nonetheless, the U.S. Administration stubbornly rejects Soviet proposals for preventing the militarization of outer space for strict compliance with the 1972 Soviet-American ABM Treaty.

What is the true purpose of the so-called Strategic Defence Initiative of the U.S.?

By seeking to attain military superiority through the "star wars" programme, the present administration is seeking to involve the Soviet Union into costly space adventures and wear it out economically.

American experts estimated in the seventies that developing an anti-missile defence would cost 4-5 times more than the development by the other side of offensive missiles capable of overcoming it.

Edward Teller, the "father of the hydrogen bomb" and dyed-in-the-wool supporter of the cold and the shooting war, claimed, apparently referring to the economic consequences of the space arms race for the Soviet Union, that if the USSR followed the American example and started devising its own large-scale space-based anti-missile defence system, the SDI effort would be justified.

It seems that Washington's "cold warriors" fear the successful implementation of the Soviet economic plans far more than the "threat" posed by Soviet missiles.

Indeed, SDI enables Washington to oblige the U.S. military-industrial elite and help it to profit from unprecedented military orders. This is one of the chief causes of the piling up of new American weapons.

It is likely that the Reagan administration will allow the monopolies to capitalize on the "star wars" plans at the expense of American tax-payers. This is well within its powers.

The situation is different in what concerns foreign policy aspects of the "star wars" plans. The Soviet leaders, referring to scientific developments, repeatedly pointed out that the USSR's response to the development in the U.S. of a large-scale anti-missile system with space-based elements would be effective, less expensive and could be carried out within a shorter period.

The response would not be necessarily in outer space.

At present already, the existing systems, including submarine-launched low-flying missiles, cruise and so on, make it possible to neutralize effectively any anti-missile defence.

The calculations currently being made in Washington are doomed to failure. White House stategists erroneously believe that in ensuring its security, the Soviet Union will follow the American scenario.

On the other hand, the real multi-billion budgets allocated for the development of the unreliable umbrella for the U.S. may exacerbate the real problems of U.S. security and economy.

Weinberger 'Pressure' on Opponents

LD240932 Moscow TASS in English 0828 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 24 TASS - TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lavrentiev reports:

The U.S. Administration is putting pressure on the opponents of the "star wars" program in a bid to win larger appropriations for SDI development projects and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger's speech at a conference of the U.S. space foundation was the latest effort in this pressure campaign.

Although the agenda of the conference dealt with future space programs, his speech was devoted almost entirely to the need to carry on SDI research and development and to secure appropriations for the purpose. Weinberger actually reduced the exploration of outer space to its militarization. To bring his view home, he did not even shrink from exploiting the memory of the crew killed in the Challenger disaster.

Weinberger actually admitted that the administration's goal today was not only continued research but also the development of components for a major partially space-based ABM system. The secretary demagogically claimed that SDI weapons should first be deployed to decide if they were destablishing.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1443

USSR: JUNE REPORTS ON ALLIED CONSIDERATION OF SDI

FRG Companies 'Undecided'

LD241138 Moscow TASS in English 0841 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn June 24 TASS -- Normally West German corporate giants never miss a chance of cashing in on the arms race. However many of them, including such pillars of the military-industrial complex, as Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm, Dill and Dornier, are still undecided whether it is expedient for them to participate in the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative", the SPIEGEL magazine reported quoting a classified document of the West German Government.

West German capital is unhappy, above all, at the fettering U.S.-dictated terms for such participation and slim prospects of getting profit, although Americans promised wonders to European companies.

West German firms and concerns are in no hurry to join the SDI, despite Bonn's painstaking efforts to thrust the participation in sinister "star wars" plans on the West German business community.

Upon returning from Washington where he had signed secret agreements with the U.S. on Bonn's part in the realization of the SDI, West German Economics Minister Martin Bangemann (Free Democratic Party) told newsmen that the government expected about 50 to 60 companies to participate in that program.

However, SPIEGEL writes, since "there isn't as much as a hint on easy profit", the interest of the West German business community in "star wars" is "at a minimum." So far two companies and one research center in West Germany took small orders from overseas. These are Schott and Zeiss, the optics manufacturers, and the University of Frankfurt am Main.

FRG To Develop Antiballistic Missile

LD241443 Moscow TASS in English 1347 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn June 24 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov reports:

The West German Government has appropriated several billion marks to develop a surface-to-air missile intended to counter not only planes and cruise missiles but also ballistic missiles, Hans Ruehl, planning chief at the General Staff of the West German Defense Ministry, announced at a NATO conference in Kiel. The conference was devoted to the fulfillment of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner had earlier reached agreement on the establishment of a U.S.-West German working group to concern itself with the development of such a missile. According to Ruehl, the new project should enable West Germany to leave behind the stage at which it was a U.S. minor partner in rocket building.

The West German corporations Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm and Dornier have already joined a number of American and British companies in the development of a long-range cruise missile, which, according to press reports, will be able to carry either conventional or nuclear warheads.

UK Signs Contracts With Washington

LD250903 Moscow TASS in English 2159 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] London June 25 TASS -- The United States and Britain signed a series of contracts on Britain's practical involvement in research on the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan. A respective agreement on this was concluded in Washington between Caspar Weinberger U.S. secretary of defence, and George Younger, head of the British Military establishment, now on a visit in the United States, the BBC news service reported.

Britain is known to be the first of Washington's partners to back the idea of translating into like the notorious "star wars" programme of the U.S. Administration and signed with it a corresponding "Memorandum on Mutual Understanding" providing for drawing British firms into research under the SDI project.

Growing Opposition in Japan

OW060831 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Pavel Potapov report]

[Text] A campaign is spreading in Japan to oppose the country's participation in a dangerous scheme called the Star Wars plan. Radio Moscow correspondent in Tokyo, Pavel Potapov, makes the following report on this campaign:

A signature-collecting campaign is now spreading across the country to appeal to the Government not to participate in the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative in whatever form. This campaign is initiated by a group of young teachers and students at the Physics Department of Hiroshima University. Mr Sako Matsui, a graduate student and representative of this group, says: It is our responsibility to prevent Japan from participating in [word indistinct] U.S. schemes which lead to a fiercer arms race and its expansion to outer space.

Teachers and students at 20 universities have thus far expressed their support for this appeal. The Science Council of Japan has also been actively participating in this campaign. It has recently adopted its second appeal, calling on the government to advocate opposition to the U.S. Star Wars plan, making the best use of Japan's international prestige. The Science

Council of Japan has also published a pamphlet entitled "What Is the SDI?" In this pamphlet, Japanese physicists said: The aim of the study related to the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative is quite clear. The Strategic Defense Initiative is a dangerous scheme, which will lead scientific research in a totally outrageous direction.

What worries the democratic forces most is the conservative government's position. The government said, with increasing emphasis, that Japan may participate in research on the Strategic Defense Initiative. It is trying to draw a rosy picture of the U.S. plan by trumpeting its merits.

The peace forces in Japan have been stepping up their opposition to the Star Wars plan and nuclear weapons, while exposing this tactic by the Liberal Democratic Party.

Opposition to space militarization is also one of the central slogans of those who are participating in an ongoing peace march on Hiroshima, an annual event.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1443

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

KARPOV COMMENTS ON SPACE ARMS AT FRG COLLOQUIUM

PM171131 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Ye. Bovkon report under the rubric "Izvestiya Interview": "Concrete Steps are Needed"]

[Excerpts] Loccum -- An international seminar on space weapons was held in the small town of Loccum in Lower Saxony on the initiative of the evangelical academy. Taking part were prominent military experts and public and political figures from the Soviet Union, the United States, Denmark, the Netherlands, the GDR, the FRG, and other countries.

After the colloquium, I asked V.P. Karpov, leader of the USSR's delegation at the Geneva talks on space and nuclear arms, to share his impressions on the character of the discussions at Loccum.

[Karpov] Above all, they reflected the very keen interest of broad circles of the Western public on the problem of freeing mankind from the danger of an arms race in space. The majority of the participants, in my opinion, had an absolutely clear idea of where the path to a peaceful space lies. The discussion confirmed the marked contrast between the positions of the USSR and the United States. Our initiatives, in particular the proposal formulated in the letter from N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to J. Perez de Cuellar, demonstrate the Soviet Union's serious commitment to the peaceful utilization of space, and not simply commitment, but willingness to share its achievements and create the material and other conditions for broad international cooperation in this sphere. The United States gambles on creating an extremely destabilizing class of arms, which would lead to consequences difficult to foresee. The introduction of qualitatively new means into the structure of strategic forces would change the entire system of evaluation of the strategic balance, increase the risk of tension and uncertainty in the world, and intensify mutual suspicion, undermining strategic stability. As a result, the security of states would be decreased sharply, and the arms control process would reach an impasse.

Authoritative scientists, including American ones, call into question the possibility of creating a 100 percent impenetrable 'antimissile shield.' One or two breaches in the antimissile armor will negate the effectiveness of the entire system. In the pursuit of the chimera of absolute invulnerability, years will be wasted, time which could have been used for the cause of disarmament. Many people in the FRG understand this. One feels that West Germans are alarmed by the foolhardly U.S. course, and by many aspects of it at that.

The American President's decision not to observe SALT II and to produce binary weapons, and in particular the behavior of the U.S. delegation at the Bern conference of experts on contacts between people, convinced many people that Europe is a matter of indifference to the United States. One could sense the concern about the future of the Stockholm conference. If only the same result does not emerge there as in Bern.

At the same time the discussion showed that along with the problem of security in general, everyone is now worried by the question: What can be done first and foremost in order to achieve real results along the path of disarmament? There is no doubt that this desire for concrete deeds explains the growing interest in the USSR's peace proposals.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1443

CPSU'S DOBRYNIN ASSAILS SDI AS DESTABILIZING

AU240836 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 20 Jun 86 p 6

[Article by Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: "For a Nuclear-Free World, Toward the 21st Century"]

[Text] Never before has science played such an important role in society, never before has the fate of civilization depended on it to such an extent -- in essence, the questions of mankind's life and death.

No one can avoid the decision about how these immense forces, awakened by human genius, will be utilized further. Just as no one can lay claim to having a monopoly, an exclusive right to decide the fate of the human community. Since Albert Einstein's times, most prominent representatives of science have been saying that no one can divest himself of responsibility in these issues -- especially not scientists.

I think that, apart from lunatic gamblers, no one will deny the destructive consequences of a nuclear catastrophe in the current situation. This, although it is strange, gives many a feeling of security -- allegedly no one will permit the unleashing of a nuclear war. Afterall, people do not want to commit suicide. It would be a great mistake to believe this. The current feverish arms buildup creates a completely new situation -- it mercilessly shortens the time in which one can make decisions, it increasingly leaves decisionmaking to machines and technology, and thus, step by step, it deprives politicians of the right to assess, discuss, and consider. Well, technology, even technology that has been tried and tested many times, can fail at times. This is attested to by the destruction of the Challenger space shuttle, the explosions of the Titan and Delta rockets, the accident in the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, and many other similar cases. One day this could be the ultimate end. Is it, perhaps, possible to permit such a risk?

Occasionally one also hears the following assertion: The threat of universal nuclear destruction is the key stabilizing factor in the current system of international relations; allegedly it has an inevitable containing influence on political representatives; it forces them to weigh every step carefully and avoid ill-considered actions. Therefore, nuclear disarmament -- these representatives think -- would necessarily lead to the escalation of international tension and would increase the number of conflicts employing conventional weapons. From this arises the conclusion that "historical logic" and "common sense" allegedly require the preservation of the existing nuclear arsenals.

Such contemplations will not stand up to comparison with the lessons of history. Weapons on their own have never played a "peace-making role." No new weapon has eliminated war, it has always added destructive potential to them.

Not one of the military inventions to date has imperiled the existence of mankind. Such a threat came into being only after the invention of nuclear weapons. But where is the guarantee that in strained crisis situations this threat will always be an effective factor of containment and will avert what cannot be corrected? Such a guarantee does not and cannot exist.

One also has to bear in mind that during the entire "nuclear century" the Western countries have not shown any political prudence and restraint at all. The United States has more than once tried to make use of the nuclear weapons as an instrument of military-political blackmail, a matter that has occasionally brought the world to the verge of nuclear catastrophe. The fact that a nuclear war has not been unleashed in these 4 postwar decades is not at all due to the "containment" power of nuclear weapons. Here, to a certain extent, the reason of politicians, and to an even greater extent the endeavor of peace-loving states, and the growth of the mass artiwar movement played their role. To a certain extent "lady luck" also played a role.

The world -- more than satiated with nuclear warheads (in the 4 postwar decades their number has risen from 2 units to 50,000 units) and their carriers, military helicopters and reconnaissance offensive complexes, nuclear submarines and naval battle vessels can be compared with a lunatic sitting on a powder keg playing with matches. In such conditions, peace can neither be relible nor firm.

The development of new weapons by one side forces the other side to undertake retaliatory measures while considering the worst variant of the development of events. And that, again, has an influence on the party that started the new round of feverish arms buildup. Thus, the vicious circle closes. Feverish arms buildup acquires its own inertia, its own perverted logic of development, and brings us close to a threshold beyond which it can become uncontrollabe and irreversible.

This fact becomes very clear when we take into consideration the qualitative aspect of feverish arms buildup. It constitutes a nonsensical chase after a "miraculous weapon," which will bring long-expected security -- a vain chase, but bringing the threat of nuclear catastrophe, the more so since the hope of that "miracle" could encourage some representatives to adventurism and the endeavor to achieve "strategic superiority," and later even to attempts to implement it.

The "Strategic Defense Initiative" program, implemented by the Reagan administration, is a great danger to maintaining peace and to the stability of the military-strategic equilibrium. If we are to believe the advocates of "star wars, Washington needs the "space shield" only to avert the threat of a first strike by the Soviet Union, to consolidate the strategic stability, and even to rid the world of nuclear weapons. But those who are taking part in the elaboration of American foreign policy must know that the Soviet Union unilaterally pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and that this pledge has become an integral component of its military doctrine; the PRC has also adopted the same pledge. If the United States, and after it France and Great Britain, were to follow their example, the issue of a first strike would cease to be topical in many respects.

The attempt to pass off the strategic Defense Initiative as an instrument for the consolidation of strategic stability, also, will not stand up to criticism. Exactly the opposite is the consequence. The creation of the "space shield," under the aegis of which some American strategists are trying to gain the potential of a scot-free, disarming nuclear strike, would lead to a profound upset in the existing equilibrium of forces, to the total destruction of the main foundations on which the strategic stability rests, and to the acceleration of the feverish arms buildup in the sphere of offensive as well as defensive strategic weapons.

The appeal to all scientists of the world, which Soviet scientists published in April 1983, states that "in a nuclear war there exist no effective means of defense, and developing them is practically impossible." This appeal also stresses: "In reality, the attempt to develop so-called defensive weapons against the other side's strategic nuclear forces, a matter about which the U.S. President talks, will inevitably result in another element that will magnify the American 'first-strike' potential.

It is no coincidence that at present the practical activity of the U.S. Administration concentrates on an accelerated development of precisely this potential. Such a 'defensive weapon' can give practically nothing to a country against which an unexpected extensive attack is aimed, because it is incapable of saving the major part of the population. Making use of antimissile weapons is most favorable for the attacking side which strives to reduce the force of a retaliatory strike. However, it cannot avert such a retaliatory strike completely."

Today, as we know, thousands of scientists from all countries share such a view, including a great number of scientists and experts in the United States, the FRG, Great Britain, Australia, and Canada.

We are not opposing feverish space armament because we fear that we cannot bear the rivalry foisted on us. Today, more than ever, we have at our disposal both sufficient knowledge, and mature experience and resources to ward off, in the best possible way, any further American step toward supremacy. As was stated by Mikhail Gorbachev, who referred to the works of our scientists, the Soviet reply to the U.S. establishment of an extensive antimissile system using space-based elements will be more effective and cheaper, and perhaps it will even be realized quicker; at the same time, it is not certain that this reply will take place in space. For instance, an extensive set of possible measures and means of resisting space arms is mentioned in the research and lectures of the Committee of Soviet Scientists for the Defense of Peace and Against Nuclear War.

The advocates of the Strategic Defense Initiative are using as an argument -- aimed, above all, at the scientific community -- the allegation that this program would ensure a radical new turn in the sphere of technologies and provide an incentive for the development of scientific thinking. But is not the human mind, including scientific thinking, predestined to be capable of foreseeing the consequences of activity, and of averting them if they are deadly? And is it really possible to achieve progress in science and technology solely by subordinating them to military goals?

On the contrary: Peaceful goals open the greatest scope for scientific research and for the utilization of its results, all for the benefit of man. It is because of this that the Soviet stand is not limited merely to unmasking the "star wars" plans and probing their murderous nature. It contains an important alternative and constructive element -- peaceful cooperation in space research. I recall that this is exactly what Mikhail Gorbachev was talking about at the meeting with the delegation of the congress of Nobel Prize winners, where he stressed that in principle we are in favor of taking a different road toward the acceleration of progress in science and technology.

Regarding space research, the USSR has proposed the setting up of an appropriate world-wide organization, which would be the center for coordinating efforts in this undertaking of universal scope. This concerns both basic scientific research and the launching of interplanetary spaceships with this aim in mind, for instance to Mars. It also concerns the utilization of the results of space research in the spheres of biology, medicine, materials science, weather forecasting, climate and environment research, and so forth. Finally, it also concerns the joint development of new space technology and its use in the interest of all mankind.

The main reliable instrument for consolidating strategic stability and reducing the danger of war would be the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms, the prevention of feverish armament in space, and the transition to realistic measures aimed at disarmament. It is necessary to agree, in an honest and businesslike manner, on specific measures for reducing and later eliminating the threat of a nuclear war. It is necessary to reach this agreement before it is too late.

The Soviet Union attributes great significance to the growing cooperation of scientists in various countries in the fight against the nuclear threat.

This cooperation has already succeeded in filling millions of people with enthusiasm. We know that such problems as the global consequences of a nuclear war, the "nuclear winter," the issues of averting feverish armament in space, the danger of a nuclear conflict breaking out by pure chance, and so forth have become the object of extensive research not only by Soviet scientists, but also by a broad circle of scientists from other countries, including the United States. On the basis of the Soviet scientists' contacts with many social organizations broad, such research work has become international and in many instances it has made it possible to formulate the stand adopted by the world scientific public, which is capable of influencing the course of events.

We trust that scientists in all countries will multiply their forces, and that in the future they will also stand among the vanguard fighters for mankind's survival, for mankind's happiness and future.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1443

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET GENERAL ON 'NEW' ELEMENTS IN GORBACHEV 16 JUNE PROPOSAL

LD241635 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 23 Jun 86

[Interview with USSR General Mikhail Milshteyn -- not further identified -- by unidentified correspondent, date and place not given]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] What is new in the proposals made by Mikhail Gorbachev?

[Milshteyn] If the United States agrees to adhere to the ABM Treaty at least for 15 years we have nothing against research limited by laboratories. That's something new. Second, we are speaking about equal levels of the strategic forces, the ICBM's, SLBM's and strategic bombers. It is not a final proposition, it's intermediate proposition from the way of [as heard] 50 percent reductions, we're interested to have radical reduction of strategic nuclear forces, but as long as the United States is not ready we're proposing intermediate solving this problem and in this connection we are ready to sign such a treaty, but at the same time it should be considered as a step on the road of drastic reduction in the near future, as it was proposed somehow by both sides, because the United States proposed 50 percent reduction and the Soviet Union proposed 50 percent reduction. The only thing is, there is a difference in what should be counted as a 50 percent.

As far as the United States is concerned, it reminds me of such an example. If you take, for instance, a heavyweight boxing contest and two heavyweight boxers are going to fight. One, is the, for instance, just for the sake of example, one is the Soviet boxer who is right-handed and the American boxer is left-handed. American side: the proposition looks like the proposition from the American boxer if it would be like this: he proposed, listen, that the right hand is a very dangerous, one because (?you normally) make great drama or whatever it is, so let's fight on a peaceful basis, let's fight with only left hand, not saying that he is left-handed and as far as the right hand is concerned, let's (?tie) it and fight only with left hand. So, sometimes the substance of the American propositions looks like the proposition of this symbolic heavyweight boxer.

[Correspondent] The Soviet side rejects the current American proposals made in Geneva. Why is this?

[Milshteyn] They count only missiles or warheads, they don't count cruise missiles, they don't count bombers, they don't count a very great component of their triad. So, but the SALT I agreement and SALT II agreement cover all three components of the strategic forces. So there couldn't be an agreement on the American platform. There could be only agreement if each side, that the Soviet side take into consideration security not only of its own security, it cannot be achieved, an agreement if one side takes into consideration of the security only of one side. [sentence as heard] There could be an agreement only on the basis of common security, and as far as the Soviet Union is concerned we are ready to take that into consideration. We are making many steps (?on) half way toward the United States.

[Correspondent] General, many American politicians allege that the more powerful the United States gets the more likely will concessions be made on the part of the Soviet Union at the talks on arms reduction and control. What is your view?

[Milshteyn] There are many naive -- I would call them naive if they wouldn't be dangerous -- opinions like this: The tougher the United States in its behavior the more concessions will be made by the Soviet Union. It's very dangerous because it will lead only to the arms race, because the Soviet Union will not make any concessions which will harm its national security.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: REPORTS ON U.S. RESPONSE TO GORBACHEV 16 JUNE SPEECH

U.S. Studying Proposals

PM191310 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 86 First Edition p 6

[Roundup of 18 June reports by own correspondents O. Losoto and A. Tarutin and TASS: "Socialism and Peace Are Indivisible"]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Union is fully determined to continue to advance confidently along the path of the country's socioeconomic development and persistently implement its peace-loving initiatives. This theme is stressed in the widespread international reactions to the results of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum.

Washington

Addressing journalists, a White House spokesman stated that Washington is studying the Soviet proposals in the arms control sphere. In this context THE WASHINGTON POST notes that within the administration there are disagreements between those who would like to continue the present course and those who believe that the Soviet peace initiatives "may provide a basis for fruitful talks."

Weinberger Rejects 'Key Elements'

LD200952 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Text] The United States Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, has rejected some key elements of a new Soviet arms control proposal dealing with space weapons. Here are some details:

Mr Weinberger said he opposes any moves that would prevent the United States from withdrawing from the ABM Treaty. The Soviet Union has proposed that the two countries abide by this treaty for at least 15 more years, while SDI research be restricted to laboratory work. Simultaneously, the Soviet Union and the United States could cut their strategic forces, that is land- and sea-based ICBMs and bombers, to equal levels, whereas medium-range weapons capable of reaching the territory of the other side, including long-range cruise missiles, could be dealt with separately. True, this country would prefer a radical, 50 precent, cut in the strategic offensive arms but we could settle for an interim offer if it helps to open up new prospects for an onward movement in arms control.

Having said "no" to key elements of the Soviet offer on keeping the SDI down to laboratory work, the Pentagon couldn't do better in explaining where the White House stands. First of all, the 1972 ABM Treaty is most likely to become its next victim following the SALT II treaty. Without killing the ABM Treaty the rout of the Soviet-American arms control and disarmament structure would be incomplete. And secondly, in the near future we can expect another flare-up of anti-Soviet rhetoric to justify the abandonment of the ABM Treaty by the United States.

That was the case with the killing of SALT II and it is going to be the same with the ABM accord.

On one hand the White House is poisoning the political climate in bilateral relations. On the other hand it has been urging a new summit as a vital means of improving them. We know that life is full of paradoxes, but there has to be a limit.

U.S. Press, Congressional Response

PM230959 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 86 First Edition p 6

[Own correspondent G. Vasilyev report: "Main Theme"]

[Text] New York, 18 Jun -- The report by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the CPSU Central Committee plenum is one of the main themes in the U.S. press, radio, and television broadcasts. In their dispatches from Moscow, correspondents of leading U.S. newspapers are covering different provisions of the report, highlighting these sections that talk about the Soviet proposals aimed at curbing the arms race and preventing nuclear catastrophe. "Mikhail Gorbachev," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, "has announced the new Soviet proposals on arms limitation according to which the Russians agree to reduce the arsenals of strategic armaments if the United States limit its plans for the deployment of weapons in space to research work and agrees to abide by the 1972 ABM Treaty for at least 15 more years."

THE WASHINGTON POST highlights M.S. Gorbachev's point that the Soviet Union has taken new steps to promote the search for mutually acceptable accords at the Geneva talks. If the U.S. side ignores the Soviet initiatives this time too, it will be clear to the whole world that the current U.S. Administration is engaged in an unworthy game in one of the gravest issues on which mankind's future depends.

The news of Moscow's new peace proposals came at a time of emerging confrontation here on important issues of U.S. foreign and military policy. The Pentagon's resumption of nuclear explosions at the Nevada test range and President Reagan's declared intention to begin dismantling existing Soviet-U.S. accords are arousing concern and protest among many people. Representatives of the mass antiwar organizations, politicans, labor union leaders, and prominent religious figures are opposing the course of an unrestrained arms race.

The debate is also flaring up on Capitol Hill. Recently the House Foreign Affairs Committee submitted a resolution urging the President to abide by the SALT II framework. A similar resolution will soon be submitted for a vote to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator Joseph Biden, a cosponsor of this document, has stated that U.S. policy has "fallen into the hands of a clique of right-wing radicals who have long been trying

to wreck the entire control structure." In the legislator's words, the efforts of those people from the military-industrial complex are seriously harming the interests of the U.S. people themselves. In the very near future there will be a vote on the draft resolution submitted by Representative Patricia Schroeder. It envisages an end to the funding of U.S. underground nuclear tests if the U.S. Administration does not take up the Soviet moratorium.

The USSR's new peace initiatives, as set out at the CPSU Central Committee plenum, are being perceived by sensible Americans as evidence that the people of the world have a real way to prevent war and consolidate international security.

U.S. Pushed to Serious Response

LD221806 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 22 Jun 86

[From "International Panorama" presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Excerpt] If countries combine their efforts for the sake of constructive aims and do not scatter or squander these efforts for the sake of hostile aims, it would be possible to not only move mountains, but to remake the planet. In recent times our country has made new, bold proposals on disarmament. This is the time to remind you that previously Soviet proposals were almost automatically not taken seriously from the word go. It was usually said that they were not serious proposals, but mere propaganda. However, there are now present two political forces that, like a strong cross wind, are pushing the U.S. Administration off its former, completely negative positions. These are its allies in battle, who are far less militantly inclined, and its own public, which has its doubts over the rationality and usefulness of military rivalry. As a result, the Soviet proposals are not now being met with hostility in Washington, as had been the case, but almost with a welcome, with expansive expressions concerning serious study of such proposals.

For example, it has been officially announced that the Soviet intermediate version on strategic arms is being considered with all seriousness. The question is also being asked regarding the seriousness of the Soviet side. For example, Vice President George Bush says: Let us hope that the Soviets are seriously inclined; if they are so inclined, they will find in the United States a serious interlocutor.

Surely our concrete, flexible initiatives that take into account the other side's misgivings seem invented, surely our proposals are evidence that we are seriously inclined. It could be added that we have a feeling of responsiblity for the fate of the world.

It is Washington in fact with its militaristic passion that lacks seriousness in this most serious of issues. For it is so important to be serious now. This is a matter of the fate of our civilization that is usually -- although not always with complete justification -- associated primarily with Europe. Much was destroyed in Europe in the last war.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: REAGAN RESPONDS TO GORBACHEV INITIATIVE IN GLASSBORO SPEECH

TASS Criticizes Speech

PM230832 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 86 First Edition p 5

["Concerning a Speech by U.S. President R. Reagan" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Washington, 22 Jun (TASS) -- U.S. President Ronald Reagan made a speech in Glassboro, New Jersey, dealing with the U.S. position on arms control issues. The President declared that "for us there can be no more important task than the reduction of nuclear weapons." In the speech there are quite a few grand words to the effect that there already exists a favorable atmosphere for a new summit meeting, that the time has come to move forward in the arms reduction issue and to strive for mutual understanding instead of suspicion, and that "talks alone are not enough" and it is time "to move on to action for the sake of peace." "If both sides really want progress," the President said, "there can now be a turning-point in the efforts to strengthen security and world peace." All these words might more aptly be addressed to the U.S. Administration itself.

The President's speech is, as usual, crammed with anti-Soviet cliches about a "promise" supposedly given by the CPSU "to subordinate the whole world to communist supremacy," about Soviet expansionism, totalitarianism, and so forth.

R. Reagan told his listeners that the Soviet Union recently "brought forward proposals concerning a wide range of issues, from the safety of nuclear power stations to the reduction of conventional forces in Europe...the most important thing is that the Soviet representatives in Geneva submitted new proposals on nuclear arms reduction."

Commenting on the President's speech, U.S. observers point out that it was aimed at relaxing the atmosphere of anxiety and protests brought about in the United States, in Western Europe and throughout the world by the latest steps taken by the administration directed at whipping up the arms race. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, "the speech is aimed at reducing the apprehensions in Congress and among the West European allies with respect to Reagan's decision to renounce the agreed limitations of SALT II.

"While expressing verbal support for arms reduction, the administration is, at the same time, continuing to undertake steps in exactly the opposite direction -- steps that lead to an increase in international tension and the threat of war. The President has just presented to Congress a secret report about the way in which the USSR and the United States have fulfilled the SALT I and SALT II agreements. The accompanying letter states plainly that the administration intends to carry out a "full program of strategic modernization," namely a program for creating first-strike strategic nuclear weapons, including the MX missile and the latest cruise missile, as well as implementing the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative."

The President once again confirms that in the future the United States will make decisions on the structure of its strategic forces without taking account of the criteria contained in SALT. To provide propaganda cover for this massive program for U.S. rearmament, the White House has once again put into circulation groundless accusations of imaginary USSR violations of SALT II.

At a press conference, a White House representative asserted that it was allegedly a "simple coincidence" that Reagan's Glassboro speech and his sending of the secret report to Congress took place on the same day.

However, this is assessed here as confirmation of the administration's intention to continue to follow the dangerous path aimed at wrecking the existing regime of arms limitation and at achieving military superiority.

Change in Stance Noted

LD212243 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 21 Jun 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Igor Surguchev]

[Excerpt] [Surguchev] Good afternoon, comrades. A broad echo abroad has been provoked by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum first and foremost due to its foreign political part. The responses are numerous and, of course, not synonymous. None the less, their leitmotiv can be singled out, which is the recognition of the fact that the Soviet Union and the socialist countries are persistently looking for ways towards improvement of the international situation, taking ever new steps towards attainment of mutually acceptable agreements with the West in the issue of arms restriction.

I would like to remind you, comrades, of the fact that our country proposes to achieve accords on nonabrogation of the agreements on antimissile defense at least for 15 years and to limit work in the field of the Strategic Defense Initiative by the level of laboratory research that has already been started by the United States. Strategic offensive armament is limited on equal levels. The question of medium-range arms that reach the territory of the other country is resolved separately in this case. Along with this it was said that the Soviet Union, of course, would prefer to negotiate about a radical, 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive arms capable of reaching one another. On the question of medium-range missiles in Europe, our country consents to British and French nuclear missiles retaining their present number in the European zone, while the correlation concerning this kind of arms between the USSR and the United States would be at zero level. We also committed ourselves to not increasing the number of medium-range missiles in Asia.

These proposals are directly addressed to the United States. Therefore it would be interesting to learn about the reaction from across the ocean. What is the reaction, first and foremost, of course, on the part of Washington officialdom? I address this question to our correspondent in the United States, Vladimir Zvyagin, who is already at the microphone. Vladimir Ilyich, do you hear me?

[Zvyagin] Yes, yes, and I think that the U.S. President Reagan's speech in the small town of Glassboro near New York on Thursday is characteristic. In this speech he stated that the latest Soviet proposals are a potentially positive basis for a further actions. It is to be noted that therein the U.S. President for the first time in many months

abstained from sweeping the Soviet proposals aside from the outset. He stated the following: We cannot accept these proposals in the form they have, but they represent a broad basis for joint further actions. It seems to me that it is not simply the position of the present administration that manifested itself, but that it is to a considerable extent also the aspiration of wide political and public circles of the United States for concrete steps, concrete actions which are being reflected herein.

NEW YORK TIMES Cited

LD222053 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 22 Jun 86

[Text] New York June 22 TASS -- The newspaper "NEW YORK TIMES" today published an article which draws attention to the clearly contradictory statements on the question of Soviet-U.S. relations and arms control made by high-ranking U.S. Administration officials, including the President himself.

Recalling that in his speech in Glassboro Ronald Reagan described the USSR's new peace proposals as a "serious effort" and called for the U.S. and the Soviet Union to "leave behind suspicion between our peoples and replace it with understanding", the paper indicates that "this is the president who has often used some very different language about the Russians and their regime". "These are also the Moscow proposals that were repeatedly brushed aside by administration leaders as mere propaganda".

"The administration has said in sequence", the paper goes on to write not without irony, "that SALT-2 is dead, that the U.S. will no longer observe its limitations, that it is not dead but just stopped existing because of Soviet violations, that the U.S. won't build more nuclear weapons than the Russians do, and that Washington's purpose is not to undermine SALT-2 but to go on to dismantling more weapons under a new, more rigorous treaty. It has said that it will abide by the anti-ballistic missile treaty, that the treaty is really elastic anyway and can accomodate star wars development, and that it doesn't like the Soviet request for a commitment not to denounce the ABM Treaty for 15 to 20 years". At the same time the administration "refuses to negoitate on an end to all nuclear tests."

"THE NEW YORK TIMES" emphasises that in light of all these discordant statements observers cannot fail to wonder as to whether Washington "was determined to bewilder and disorient" the Soviet leadership with conflicting policy statements. "The surface evidence doesn't require a great stretch of the imagination, though, to conclude that somebody somewhere is busy making sure that signals (about U.S. intentions -- TASS note) are regularly crossed", "THE NEW YORK TIMES" observes. "It isn't surprising to hear questions about a confusion plot".

"THE NEW YORK TIMES" arrives at the conclusion that there is, certainly, "no visible decision to set forth coherent, consistent, cogent statements of American policy, so that both friends and adversaries can know what to expect from the U.S...various administration spokesmen as well as important members of Congress and people of influence go off in so many directions that the streamers merely flap, without a prevailing wind".

"There isn't much chance in the circumstances that either side will 'leave suspicion behind'. Adminstration zigzag talk only serves to increase it, including the suspicion that Washington is deliberately scheming to confuse...it is time to explode the confusion-plot theory and enounce clear policy".

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S PETROVSKIY ADDRESSES CD, ASSAILS U.S. STANCE

Critical of U.S. Stand

LD241546 Moscow World Service in English 1400 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy has said at the conference on disarmament in Geneva that, although the United States claims to favor an agreement, it refuses to respect the existing agreements like the SALT II treaty. Petrovskiy said the Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms had not moved a single inch, because the administration in Washington had refused to reply positively to the realistic compromise proposals put forward in Geneva by the Soviet Union.

Sees 'Complete' Lack of Progress

AU241548 Paris AFP in English 1542 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, United Nations, June 24 (AFP) -- The U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks in Geneva are "characterised by a complete absence of progress," the Soviet deputy foreign minister, Vladimir Petrovskiy, said Tuesday.

"We put our proposals on the table -- we have received no response," he said at a press conference. The proposals include a 15-year extension in the upholding of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty that was put forward last month by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Mr. Petrovskiy said the talks were stagnating at a time when the arms race, in conventional weapons, was heating up and space was threatened with militarisation. The talks focus on reductions in the numbers of medium- and long-range nuclear missiles and preventing the spread of the arms race to space.

In other comments, Mr. Petrovskiy told the U.N. Conference on Disarmament here Tuesday that a treaty banning nuclear testing was "a top priority." He called for simultaneous solution of the issues of verification and prohibition that have hindered progress on this question. The Soviet Union has unilaterally banned nuclear tests until August, but the United States has said it will continue with its programme. As far as agreement on chemical weapons was concerned, Mr. Petrovskiy said, Washington's recent decision to manufacture binary chemical shells "gives us serious grounds to doubt."

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

SOVIET INTERIM PROPOSAL SEEKS TO BREAK GENEVA 'STANDSTILL'

LD171421 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1305 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Commentary by Vladimir Chernysev, TASS military affairs observer]

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jun (TASS) -- The alarming international situation insistently dictates that the existing mechanisms of bilateral and multilateral talks on limitation and reduction of weapons and on disarmament must work effectively, and not be employed as a screen for justifying an arms race. The Budapest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee called upon other countries to unify efforts aimed at ending the arms race on earth and preventing one in space. Named among the urgent tasks was that of achieving specific accords at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva.

How then do matters stand at those talks? Unfortunately, the U.S. side has no desire at all to manifest serious willingness to embark on a practical resolution of the principal problems of eliminating the nuclear threat. Washington has not made a constructive revision of its proposals on strategic weapons presented last November, directed toward gaining unilateral advantages for the United States. It is blocking a resolution on eliminating nuclear weapons in Europe by referring to the stance of Britain and France, and by demanding a weakening in the USSR's defenses on the eastern borders while the U.S. is continuing to create and deploy more and more new nuclear weapons and making intensive preparations for the militarization of space.

In a conversation with the editors of provincial newspapers and television and radio companies the other day, the head of the White House stated directly: "We are now carrying out a program of modernizing our forces...we have no intention of renouncing this program...the moment is approaching when we will have to go beyond the framework envisaged by SALT II in order to continue this modernization." Do such statements and practice by official Washington accord with the declarative statements by U.S. Administration spokesmen on their alleged interest in reducing nuclear arsenals? Obviously not.

It is not without reason that the U.S. mass information media class all this as "a plan to win the arms race" and come to the conclusion that there is a continuing lack of confidence regarding the United States in matters relating to arms control. This is due to the fact that the administration does not demonstrate a serious approach to these problems. Senator J. Biden gave a frank description of the situation that has come about: "In the U.S. Administration, control over arms policy is in the hands of those who have for many years tried to mess up the entire structure of arms limitation." Such a policy leads to the world, in the graphic expression of THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, finding itself at a sinister crossroads of uncertainty.

It is quite clear that in such circumstances, the Soviet Union was faced with the question of whether to continue to stay at a standstill in the Geneva negotiations -- squabbling with the United States, which suits the Americans very well -- or to seek new approaches that will allow the way to be cleared toward cutting nuclear armaments? Without doubt, this is an important and serious question. The USSR has already gone too great a part of the way in its striving to create conditions for drawing up constructive accords, while the United States has simply not budged from its ossified position. There is, however, an awareness in the USSR of very high responsibility toward the peoples and mankind for the destiny of peace in our nuclear and space era. It is for this reason that, guided by the aspiration to bring about a radical turnaround for the better in the present difficult situation, the decision was taken to continue firmly to adhere to the policy of practical search for a mutually-acceptable agreement in Geneva.

On 11 June the USSR delegation at Geneva introduced an interim variant of a solution to problems connected with the non-militarization of space and with reducing strategic weapons. It was proposed to reach an accord between the USSR and the United States on staying within the ABM treaty for at least 15 years, and to restrict work in the field of SDI to the level of laboratory research, that is, the threshold which the United States has in practice already reached.

In the field of stratetic offensive weapons, the USSR of course would prefer to agree immediately on a radical, 50 percent reduction in all such weapons of the Soviet Union and of the United States capable of reaching each other's territory. But it is ready now, as an interim measure, to go as far as limiting, to equal levels, intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers, that is, those components of strategic offensive forces which in the United States it is customary to call the "strategic triad." The question of intermediate-range weapons capable of reaching the other side, including land-based cruise missiles, would thereby be tackled separately.

The new proposals of the USSR again demonstrate the Soviet Union's aspiration to guarantee the achievement of a mutually acceptable accord, to bar the way to the nuclear arms race, and as quickly as possible to move on to their mutual reductions -- moreover, deep reductions, as has already been calculated by the WASHINGTON POST. Acceptance of the variant proposed by the Soviet Union would mean reducing strategic nuclear weapons by approximately one-third, as an interim measure on the road to still more significant reductions.

Time will show how these proposals will be perceived by the U.S. leadership. But it should even now be clear in Washington that if it ignores the Soviet initiatives this time too, it will become obvious that the present U.S. administration is playing an unserious game on a most serious issue, on which the future of mankind depends.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS MILITARY COMMENTATOR DOUBTS U.S. COMMITMENT

LD181318 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 18 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

The disturbing international situation urgently requires that the existing mechanisms of bilateral and multilateral negotiations on limiting and reducing armaments and on disarmament should operate effectively, rather than be used as a cover-up for the arms race.

The Budapest meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee came out with a call on other countries to pool efforts with a view to ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space.

The task of achieving concrete agreements at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments in Geneva was named among the burning problems.

How are the talks going on? Regrettably, the American side does not wish to display a serious readiness to start tackling the important problems of eliminating the nuclear menance.

Washington has not as yet revised constructively its proposals concerning strategic armaments, tabled in November last year and directed at gaining unilateral advantages for the United States.

It blocks the solution of the question of abolishing nuclear weapons in Eruope by references to the postion of Britain and France, by the demand for weakening Soviet defences on the eastern borders while keeping the American Armed Forces posted in that region.

In effect, the U.S. is continuing the development and deployment of ever new nuclear weapons and is intesively preparing for the militarization of outer space.

The White House chief, during his conversation with editors of regional newspapers, television and radio companies the other day, remarked, "we are engaged now in modernization programme.... We're not going to retreat from that modernization.... There is coming a moment in which, to continue with that modernization, will take us beyond the terms of SALT."

Do such remarks and practical deeds by the official Washington tally with the declarations of administration officials about their alleged interest in nuclear arms reductions? Certainly not.

U.S. mass media bodies classify all that as a plan to win the arms race, and conclude that the absence of trust in the U.S. on the questions of arms control persists because the administration does not show a serious approach to these problems.

Senator Joseph Biden, in describing frankly the situation, said that within the U.S. Administration, control over arms policy was in the hands of those who for many years sought to disrupt the entire set-up of arms reductions.

The policy of this sort, THE LOS ANGELES TIMES put it, was taking the world to the ominous crossroads of uncertainty.

It is perfectly clear that under these circumstances, the Soviet Union has been confronted with the question of whether to continue marking the time at the Geneva talks and squabbling with the Americans, which quite suits them, or look for new approaches making it possible to clear the way for nuclear arms reductions.

The question is, undoubtedly, important and serious. The USSR has covered too long a part of the road in its desire to create conditions for working out constructive agreements, while the U.S. has failed to move an inch. The Soviet Union realizes its lofty responsibility to the peoples and nations for the destinies of peace in the nuclear and space age.

That is why, guided by the desire to achieve a radical turn for the better in the present-day complicated situation, the decision was adopted to stick firmly to the line towards the practical search for a mutually acceptable aggreement in Geneva.

On June 11, the Soviet delegation tabled in Geneva an interim option for resolving the problems of non-militarization of outer space and reduction of strategic armaments.

It was proposed to conclude a Soviet-American agreement on remaining within the anti-ballistic missile treaty for at least 15 years, while limiting SDE work to laboratories, that is the level practically attained by the U.S.

In the field of strategic offensive armaments, the USSR would surely prefer to agree on a radical, 50-per cent reduction of all such weapons of the USSR and the United States, which reach the territories of each other.

Already now, it is prepared to agree, as an interim step, on the restriction down to equal levels of the inter-continental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers, that is the components of the strategic offensive forces called the strategic triad in the U.S.

The question of medium-range armaments, reaching the other side, including ground-based cruise missiles, would be handled separately.

The USSR's latest proposals demonstrate yet another time its desire to ensure the conclusion of a mutually acceptable agreement, put an obstacle in the way of the nuclear arms race and start mutual cuts, deep cuts at that, as soon as possible.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper, accepting the Soviet proposal would mean the reduction of the strategic nuclear armaments by about one-third as an interim measure towrds deeper cuts. Time will show what the U.S. leadership's response to the proposals will be. But it ought to be clear to Washington even now that if it, this time as well, ignores the Soviet initiatives, this will become apparent that the present American Administration is not being serious in the most serious question which determines the future of mankind.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET GENERAL VOLKOGONOV DISCUSSES STRATEGIC MILITARY PARITY

LD171910 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in German 1930 GMT 16 Jun 86

[Commentary by Colonel General Dmitriy Volkogonov, military analyst; in Russian fading into German translation[

[Text] In the world arena two concepts currently confront one another. The U.S. and its NATO allies adhere in practice to the course of ensuring their own security at the expense of ensuring the same for their political opposites. For the realization of these concepts, the U.S. Administration has quite openly set out to achieve unilateral military advantage over the Soviet Union. The Soviet concept, on the other hand, starts from the truly just principle of equal security for all. It is only by actually observing this principle in practice that one can finally pursue the path of a gradual, progressive reduction of nuclear arms up to their full elimination by the year 2000.

It is well-known that this strategic anti-war plan, this plan for a nuclear weapon-free world, was submitted by Mikhail Gorbachev in January of this year. Also, the participants in the recent deliberations of the PCC of the Warsaw Pact members in Budapest stated that they supported the plan submitted by the Soviet Union for the full liquidation of nuclear weapons and other types of mass destruction weapons everywhere by the end of this century. The topicality and the far-reaching nature of this Soviet plan are attracting the broadest attention of progressive world public opinion. But the West, and above all Washington, has so far made no positive reply to the Soviet initiative.

As can be seen from the numerous statements by Caspar Weinberger and other hawks, the U.S. does not intend to relinquish its policy of achieving a decisive, great superiority. This is why the fate of the preservation of peace is, today more than ever before, most closely linked with the possibilities that the Soviet Union and its allies possess for the protection of peace. It has become apparent today that no agreement has been reached on mutual, balanced and step-by-step destruction of nuclear weapons and, in view of the militaristic challenge, guarantees for security exist only because of the capability of socialism to maintain strategic military parity. The establishment of this is assessed in the new CPSU Program as an historic achievement of socialism. The approximate balance in strategic forces consolidates the position of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and completely upsets the calculations of the aggressive imperialist circles for victory in nuclear war. The CPSU Program stresses that the preservation of this balance constitutes the guarantee for maintaining peace and international security.

The protection of socialism takes as its point of departure the important political condition of maintaining the Soviet Armed Forces at a level that excludes strategic superiority on the part of imperialism. Not doing so would be tantamount to encouraging the potential aggressor who, as the facts prove, has not renounced attempts to achieve unilateral military advantages and to decide the main contradictions of the epoch in his favor through military means.

It is no secret that in recent years alone the Pentagon has elaborated quite a few scenarios for achieving a decisive military victory. For the planners in the NATO bunkers, for example, the most advantageous for them would be the model of a possible war that is limited to the territory of Western Europe and the Soviet Union while keeping the United States outside. In the opinion of the U.S. military office, however, this could only be achieved if the U.S. nuclear missile forces in Europe are such that chey would divert a considerable part of the potential of the Soviet Union's [word indistinct] to themselves. But even this is too little for them today. Today in the Pentagon, as is well-known, particular hopes are attached to the so-called SDI, the purpose of which is to establish a space-based strike system that would offer the possibility of making a first strike against the adversary and also prevent a retaliatory strike, or at least to rapidly weaken such a strike.

Those who are in the highest organs of power across the ocean and those who hold the tiller of the arms industry complex are, in forcing the star wars plans through to the point of practical realization, putting the future of the whole world at risk. The fact of the matter is that the U.S. military space program, should it be implemented, would torpedo the negotiations on arms control and cancel the already existing agreements. Moreover, the U.S. Administration has already embarked on a path of throwing overboard the existing accords by actually abrogating SALT II. As a result, the situation of strategic chaos and military instability is most grave. If the basis of strategic balance is shaken or cracked, no one will be able to guarantee that instead of, as the U.S. President said, SDI helping to make nuclear weapons obsolete, the space strategists might nonetheless use them.

The war hawks do not seem to realize that the Soviet Union will in no way allow the United States to gain unilateral advantage, whether on earth or in space, and the pursuit of this unattainable dream of military superiority is a fruitless and dangerous policy. If the leaders of the United States and NATO would grasp this unalterable truth then our country's historic, constructive proposals for bilateral, step-by-step reduction in the level of strategic balance until the elimination of nuclear weapons could become the basis for a cardinal change for the better in our world. As long as this does not happen, however, socialism's capability to maintain the balance of strength at a very high level is endangered by fault of the Americans. This parity offers the chief material guarantee of security that serves the preservation of peace.

Here one must take into account the fact that the Soviet strategic forces are intended only for a retaliatory strike because of our peace-loving policy and the government commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. On the other hand, U.S. weapons are intended for dealing a first strike. The strategic balance makes ephemeral the hopes of the militaristic circles of the United States and the Pentagon military clique for the possibility of victory in a nuclear war.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1444

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET GENERAL CHERVON COMMENTS ON SDI, SALT II, SS-20'S

PM191436 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 17 Jun 86 p 12

[Interview with Soviet Army General Nikolay Chervov by Andrea Tarquini in Budapest, date not given]

[Text] Budapest -- "It was the winter of 1941 and the wind and snow lashed at our cheeks and overcoats. I was a few years younger than you, a young lieutenant fresh out of the academy, and it was in that infantry unit that I held my first command -- outside the gates of Moscow, against the Wehrmacht." General Nikolay Chervov relaxed for a moment to recall epic and grim episodes of the past.

He went on, with his combination of old-fashioned pride and nostalgia: "What I mean is that our strategy does not give in so easily in the face of unexpected challenges. If this were to happen it would mean chaos for us." When meeting with journalists, Chervov dons his empire-style khaki uniform and black boots -- a face reminiscent of Anthony Quinn's atop a beribboned dress jacket.

[Tarquini] So, General, how are you coping with the American challenge?

[Chervov] We will respond to rearmament tit for tat, nuclear warhead for nuclear warhead, missile for missile, if they start again. We will never be the first to rearm. Ours remains a defensive strategy aimed solely at national security. We will defend parity at all costs.

[Tarquini] But, General, was it not your excessively large arsenal that prompted an insecure America to protect itself?

[Chervov] No, Reagan told us one thing, then did another. They averred they did not want more strategic missiles than us, while at the same time striving to gain an advantage in other areas -- from cruise missiles to the SDI project. Now not even those weapons are enough for them: They want a return to superiority in strategic missiles. I repeat: We will not permit them to do so. If they violate the treaty, all its restrictions will cease to be valid for us too.

[Tarquini] With what weapons can you respond?

[Chervov] With more heavy missiles, more warheads, and more bombers. Also with missile-launching submarines or other weapons.

We will simple keep up with them, as we have always succeeded in doing since the beginning of the cold war.

Remember, they have never succeeded in gaining a lasting advantage, and they will not succeed this time either. Not even with SDI. The Americans overestimate their technological advantages. Sooner or later we will catch up.

[Tarquini] So will you leave Geneva slamming the door behind you, as you did over the Euromissiles?

[Chervov] No, I am not saying that. The situation in Geneva is difficult and Reagan must bear the responsibility for it. Both before and after the announcement that America is to tear up SALT II we submitted proposals, and they have failed to reply. We want to continue negotiating.

[Tarquini] What have you proposed?

[Chervov] We have submitted a draft agreement on Euromissiles: They insist that we eliminate all our SS 20's, even those deployed in Asia; we respond by offering to eliminate all the SS 20's and SS 4's and also 18 ship-borne missiles from the Baltic in exchange for all the cruise and Pershing missiles. They have not yet replied.

[Tarquini] What do you intend to offer the Europeans? You propose separate negotiations to Paris and London, but you cannot offer the same SS 20's in Geneva, then to the French and British as well...

[Chervov] Yes we can: We are offering them too a reduction in our SS 20's proportionate to their own forces. It depends on how things go in Geneva: If necessary we will also offer to reduce other kinds of weapons. We shall see, once we have started negotiating. We do not have preconceived stances.

[Tarquini] But, General, does the prospect of a nuclear peace without arms limitation not weigh negatively on our strategy?

[Chervov] I repeat: No. What concerns us more are the changes of strategy in Washington: It seems to us that the new American chiefs of staff have fewer reservations about rearmament plans than their predecessors. I believe that the military-industrial complex has a more attentive audience in them.

[Tarquini] Ah, yes, the military-industrial complex. Do you Soviet military leaders realize what a burden you place on your own economy?

[Chervov] We realize it more than you think. It is in the interests of the country's security and stability to have a lull in the arms race that wil permit us to construct new and better cities and to give the people more consumer goods. But believe me: Our people are fully aware of security requirements and will understand us.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS CITES FRG SPD LEADER ON SDI, SALT II

LD221557 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 22 Jun 86

[Text] West Berlin, June 22 TASS -- "If the Social-Democratic Party comes to power in Bonn, it will cancel without delay the agreement with the United States on the involvement of the Federal Republic of Germany in the 'star wars' programme", said Hans Jochen Vogel, chairman of the group of the Social-Democratic party of Germany (SPD) in the Bundestag.

Speaking at the congress of the Social Democratic Party of West Berlin here, he warned Washington against jettisoning adherence to the SALT II treaty and demanded that the Soviet Union's proposals on disarmament be made the subject of serious talks. The United States' refusal to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing is an error of great magnitude, Vogel stressed.

Criticizing the policy of the Bonn Cabinet, he noted that when the current coalition took office it promised to ensure peace by diminishing weapons stockpiles. In reality, however, the arms race continually builds up steam during the rule of the CDU/CSU-FDP coalition.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW 'TOP PRIORITY' PANEL ON SALT II, ABM TREATY, SDI, INF

LD231525 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 22 Jun 86

["Top Priority" program, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov, with Professors Radomir Bodganov and Sergey Plekhanov "of the Moscow-based Institute for United States of America and Canada Studies"]

[Excerpts] [Kuznetsov] First, an observation concerning June. It's a month when mass vacations begin; at the same time it's one of the most politically action-packed months in U.S.-Soviet relations. Well, I think it's due to political timetables rather than sunspots. Here are a few examples. Take June 1973. Our two countries signed an accord concerning the peaceful use of atomic energy and also an agreement to govern Soviet-American negotiations. Or take June of 1979, when the SALT II treaty was signed in Vienna, Austria. There is bitter irony in the fact that 7 years later, in June 1986, the SALT II treaty was pronounced dead by the Reagan administration. So my first question, or rather suggestion, to you, Professor Bogdanov, is that we take stock of the current situation in Soviet-American relations.

[Bogdanov] Well, unfortunately, I have no rosy picture to present to you and to present to our listeners over there. I am afraid that the Soviet-American relations are rolling now to its lowest level. And, you know, I cannot help but to say that June is a month of funerals, you know, very sad funerals and very important funerals. If something is dead you always think who is dead, what is dead, and to my mind not just the SALT II treaty is dead, the whole conception of Soviet-American arms control, the whole conception, the whole (?structure) of Soviet-American relations is dead by the denial of SALT II treaty.

[Kuznetsov] We still have the ABM Treaty.

[Bogdanov] We still have an ABM Treaty, but my suspicion is that the next target for those people taking the upper hand in the White House is just the ABM Treaty, and I am dead sure that that is their strategic design, you know, to kill the last remnants of the Soviet-American structure one by one. Now they killed SALT II, the next target is ABM Treaty. Let me say something of the sort, you may not agree with me, but that's my feeling really that we have witnessed a kind of coup d'etat in the White House. What I mean by that, we were used for so many years of the Reagan administration that we have witnessed some pragmatic people in the administration. Some people in the State Department, they were trying to put on the right rail -- track -- Soviet-American relations, they were trying to do something at least to improve it. Now my impression that the State Department has been taken over finally by those people who wouldn't like to have nothing with [as heard] the Soviet Union. That's my very grim,

you know, assessment. Maybe I am wrong, but being a student of this administration for the last 6 years I come to that conclusion. And the SALT treaty failure, you know, how it was done, in what way, just proves to me that a kind of a coup d'etat had happened in the White House.

[Kuznetsov] But according to the latest story by Bernard Gwertzman in THE NEW YORK TIMES, he says that the State Department people still resist and they still disagree on certain things with the administration, with the Pentagon, and still believe that there is room for genuine progress. That's what he said.

[Bogdanov] You know, I wish I could agree with Bernie Gwertzman. I respect him very much as a very high-class journalist and very knowledgeable, very informed one. Maybe he has in mind, you know, the frontline, with very few people left which are not yet killed by high artillery [laughs], and that's what he means. If it is so I agree with him, but I mean that the institution, that the, you know, positive factor in the Soviet-American relations to my mind the State Department ruined.

[Kuznetsov] To back you up on what you said when you painted a rather grim picture of Soviet-American relations, I have two reports. One says that the United States Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has rejected certain key elements of the new Soviet arms control offer concerning the Strategic Defense Initiative. Mr Weinberger, according to this report, said that he is against any moves that would prevent the United States from refusing to abide by the ABM Treaty. And another report by the UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL says that President Reagan has assured Afghan counter-revolutionaries, when they met with the President in the White House, that he would not sign an arms control agreement with Moscow at the expense of their movement. My question to you, Professor Plekhanov, could you respond to these two reports?

[Plekhanov] You know, I think that's a clear reflection of the priorities of foreign policy of the current administration in Washington, because if they consider that building up arms is more important than constraining the arms race, or that it is more important to support terrorist movements trying to overthrow legitimate governments in various parts of the world than to conclude agreements with the Soviet Union, then everything becomes logical. I mean, it's easy to see why we have problems in Soviet-American relations, just a wrong set of priorities. Instead of trying to cool down the passions and to lower the risk of confrontation between East and West, between the Soviet Union and the United States, they are fanning up the flames. They are doing some very dangerous things and I am afraid that these two episodes that you refer to are the two key elements of what is called the Reagan doctrine.

[Kuznetsov] My feeling about the President's pledge to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries not to sign any agreement with Moscow at the expense of their movement is that this report, in my view -- if I'm mistaken, please correct me -- amounts to an admission that Soviet-American relations have been shoved into a very far corner of American politics, shoved far beyond the level of any significance.

[Bogadanov] Yeah, I tend to agree with you and I think you are quite right. A fact is a fact. The Soviet-American relations now are, as I put it already, at such a low level that, you know, the President of the great country can afford to discuss even diplomatic recognition, you know, for the rebels, and though his recognition was not accorded but they had discussed it, that's what's the matter. You know, they have seriously discussed it and the President hinted that in case they will get all the, you know, state attributes and the other -- some other -- people will join in recognizing

them, then United States will follow. You know, the fact itself that the United States reached such a point when they can just to [as heard] link arms control with Afghan bandits on one side and the Soviet-American relations on the (?far) -- on the other -- side, that's what really proves once again my maybe extreme view about the coup d'etat which had happened in the White House.

[Kuznetsov] Well, in my last edition of "Top Priority" you, Professor Bogdanov, promised to take a look at the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee and especially at its decisions concerning conventional weapons and forces in Europe.

[Kuznetsov] Another point I'd like to make is that when Mikhail Gorbachev advanced his proposal on 15th January to get rid of all nuclear weapons and ban space-strike weapons by the end of this century, some people said that judging by the order of priorities, judging by the way the statement was arranged, the Soviets and their allies don't give too much importance to conventional weapons because they were mentioned as the last thing during the third stage.

[Bogdanov] I am afraid that there is a very convincing logic in our January statement. Why it was focussed on nuclear arms first of all. He focussed on the main danger, the most dangerous part of our Armament. And if you are, you know, clever enough reader you could have noticed not only between lines but some very important paragraphs in this statement connected with conventional arms. By the way, in that statement it was already mentioned that the danger is that some weapons systems, conventional weapons systems, are of the same might now that they may be compared to the tactical nuclear weapons. We have already laid ground for that work. So first we focussed attention on our disarmament plan (?in liquidation) of nuclear arms, then, after some months, Mikhail Gorbachev in Berlin gave some more concrete proposals on conventional arms, then, at the Political Council of Warsaw Treaty in Budapest we have suggested the comprehensive, you know, plan how to deal with conventional arms. If you link all these three things I believe that our listeners may come to the conclusion there is a logic in that.

[Kuznetsov] At the full-scale meeting of the Communist Party's Central Committee our leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, has unveiled a set of new Soviet offers in the area of arms control. What are they? This question to you, Professor Plekhanov.

[Plekhanov] What the Soviet Union is offering now, and that offer has been made at the negotiating table already, in Geneva, is that both sides commit themselves not to break out of the ARM Treaty of 1972 for at least 15 years. It is an important holding action because the SDI, the American SDI, is now already very gravely undermining the ABM Treaty, and what we are offering now is that we keep the treaty for at least 15 years and limit the work in the sphere of SDI to just research.

[Kuznetsov] Laboratory research.

[Plekhanov] Laboratory research who... and that's actually the thresnold at which the U.S. program is now finding itself. So that would be, of course, a less far-reaching step than simply banning. We have been insisting on a complete ban on all space-strike weapons, but since the United States has now...

[Kuznetsov interrupting] Already adopted.

[Plekhanov resumes] Yeah, it's already reached its level and since it's been very, you know, recalcitrant in its position, what we are now doing is offering a step which could accomodate both sides and could still put a cap on this very dangerous trend. The other one involves cuts in the numbers of strategic offensive weapons. As far as the medium-range offensive missiles are concerned -- offensive forces are concerned -- it could be decided separately and we could have a separate agreement on that. So that's a modification of our position which should provide an opening and a breakthrough, if you will, at the talks in Geneva, so that we could conclude an agreement to the (?effect).

[Kuznetsov] Looking at the numerous Soviet initiatives, one can notice that they are in constant flux, in a constant movement. Some of them are amended, others are dropped, new ones appear. For example, like you said, the issue of medium-range weapons capable of reaching the territory of the other side, including long-range land-based cruise missiles, has been proposed to be dealt with separately from strategic weapons, and we all remember that some time ago we considered Pershing-21 missiles and Tomahawks deployed in Europe as a hefty addition to the American strategic arsenal because of their proximity to our borders, short flight time. You know, Pershings can strike our targets here in this country in 6 to 8 minutes, they have devastating accuracy and a very sufficient (?shields). Could you explain all these modifications in the Soviet position? Some interpret them as a sign of weakness.

[Bogdanov] I would put it like that. First of all it's a sign of creative capabilities of our side. Number two, we are really always in flux. Why? Because we are keeping our fingers on the American position, just trying to study, to understand it, and wherever it is possible just to accommodate. I put this word deliberately, to accommodate Americans, to help them, to help them to come to an agreement with us. Once it leads to real arms control, to arms agreements, it is OK with me.

[Kuznetsov] But at the same time, Professor Plekhanov, our leader has said, and has repeatedly warned, that we would not allow American superiority.

[Plekhanov] We can have a deal with the United States on the basis of equal security and the modification of our position has to do not with offering an edge to the Americans, or granting them an edge, but it has to do with simply moving toward the goal of nuclear disarmament step by step, putting certain things up front on which agreement can be reached in the near future and putting off more difficult elements until a more opportune time.

[Bogdanov] (?Well), I am sorry Sergey, what we are doing now, we always open windows of opportunities for the Americans, that is for them now to take it or not.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, our time is up. I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on "Top Priority", a weekly panel discussion of major world events. Welcome to "Top Priority" a week from now at the same time and on the same wavelength.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

XINHUA CALLS SOVIET PROPOSAL NOTEWORTHY 'INTERIM AGREEMENT'

OW261017 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 1456 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, 24 Jun (XINHUA) -- News Analysis: A Noteworthy "Interim Agreement"

[By] XINHUA reporter Tang Xiushan

Because the Soviet-U.S. disarmament talks in Geneva had been at a standstill for a long time, the Soviet Union recently proposed an "interim agreement," which Soviet leader Gorbachev described as a new step taken by the Soviet Union to reach a mutually acceptable agreement at the Geneva talks. Initially the proposal differs from previous Soviet proposals in the following three noteworthy points:

First, the Soviet Union has changed its previous staunch position of diametrically opposing the United States' "Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]", and began to recognize its existence and agree to a star wars program limited to laboratory research, that is, to a program limited to the level the United States has already reached. At the same time, the Soviet Union has proposed that both sides agree not to withdraw from the treaty limiting antiballistic guided missile defense systems for a period of at least 15 years. In view of the treaty's stipulation that both sides not set up nationwide antiballistic guided missile defense systems, the proposal actually demands that the United States not deploy space strike weapons for the next 15 years.

Second, prior to this proposal, the Soviet Union had proposed that both sides reduce their offensive strategic weapons by 50 percent during a period of between 5 to 8 years. Now, the Soviet Union has lowered its demand by proposing that both sides limit their offensive strategic weapons to equal ceilings. The so-called "equal ceilings" means having a flexible quota, and demands only "equal" limitation. It is said that the Soviet side has already proposed a 30-percent reduction, thus cutting the scale and slowing down the pace of the reduction.

Third, in the past, the Soviet Union emphasized that the reduction of offensive strategic weapons has "possibly only under the condition that both the Soviet and U.S. sides refuse to manufacture, test, and deploy space strike weapons." However, as far as the reduction of offensive strategic weapons is concerned, the "interim agreement" does not include the precondition of tying the reduction to space arms, and actually agrees that these two issues can be solved separately.

Judging from the "interim agreement," although the Soviet Union has somewhat changed its position and lowered its demands, the proposal for "equal ceilings" does not mean allowing the United States to gain extra advantage. In a nutshell, the Soviet Union absolutely does not allow the United States to gain military supremacy, and the Soviet stand of preventing the United States from getting a head start in deploying space weapons remains basically unchanged.

After the Soviet Union made the latest proposal at the Geneva talks, Regan, who had consistently refused downright any Soviet proposal for disarmament, made a certain positive appraisal of the latest Soviet proposal in a recent speech at Glassboro. He said: This is a beginning of serious efforts by the Soviet side to reduce nuclear weapons, and may become a turning point in the Soviet-U.S. nuclear arms talks. What he appreciated was primarily the point that the Soviet Union no longer demanded that he gave up "SDI" and did not insist that abandoning space arms be a precondition for the reduction of strategic weapons. However, Reagan added, without amendments, the latest Soviet proposal would be unacceptable to the United States.

It seems that the United States has somewhat shifted its position. However, it is not an easy task to reach an accord because the disarmament talks, which are extremely complicated issues, involve the vital interests of both sides.

/9738
CSO: 5200/4048

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRC: U.S.-SOVIET ARMS TALKS END WITHOUT PROGRESS

OW261727 Beijing XINHUA in English 1555 GMT 26 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, June 26 (XINHUA) -- The 5th round of the U.S.-Soviet negotations on nuclear and space weapons ended here today after the two superpowers failed to reach any agreement. Before the U.S. and Soviet delegations met in the American mission here this morning, Soviet chief delegate Victor Karpov said that he has not perceived "any progress" in the current round of talks which started May 8.

During the past seven weeks, the Soviet delegation put forward several proposals on strategic, intermediate and space weapons reduction which have been rejected by the American side as "old offers in new wraps". However, when the Soviet Union proposed a package of arms reduction proposals in Jun 11 which would allow the research of outer space weapons in laboratories, U.S. President Ronald Reagan said it could be a "turning point" in the U.S.-Soviet relations. Nevertheless, Reagan insisted that the United States could not accept the proposals "without changes".

Informed sources said that a new round of arms talks may begin here on September 18.

The U.S. chief delegate, Max Kampelman, told reporters today that despite the "true, important and substantial differences" between the United States and the Soviet Union, there still exist "possibilities for serious and constructive discussions." He expressed the hope that the next round of talks will open ways for serious dialogues and lead to an agreement in certain aspects of arms control.

/9738
CSO: 5200/4050

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

BEIJING REVIEW: ARMS RACE SEEN STILL ON GRUELING COURSE

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English No 25, 23 Jun 86 p 10

[Commentary by Peng Di]

[Text]

Despite worldwide pleas to curb the escalating arms race between the two superpowers, neither side is ready to relinquish superiority in the name of sensibility.

The US government recently proposed a military budget of US$311.6 billion for fiscal year 1987, an increase of 8.2 percent over 1986. Its programme for the development of new strategic weapons includes turning out and deploying more MX missiles; stepping up research and production of miniature intercontinental missiles; building the 14th Trident submarine and advanced submarine-based missiles and conducting further research on "invisible" bombers capable of shunning radar pursuit.

Since Washington thinks the Soviet Union exceeds the United States in chemical weapons by a ratio of 10:1, it has resolved to resume its production, which was halted 17 years ago. Conventional weapons also will be renovated. And US President Ronald Reagan's pet project the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) will absorb US$4.8 billion of the defence budget in 1987, compared with this year's US$2.7 billion.

Moscow does not intend to lag behind in its arms stockade. With highly destructive SS-25s — the fifth-generation of USSR-made intercontinental missiles in the process of deployment — and the highly accurate SS-18s the fourth generation of intercontinental missiles near the end of deployment, the Soviet Union is working on SS-X-24 mobile intercontinental missiles while directing more efforts towards the production of SS-20 medium-range missiles and a new type of SU-27 aircraft. Moreover, thousands of Soviet scientists and engineers are occupied with the research of laser technology capable of missile interception.

The Kremlin has been more active on the issue of disarmament. It is quite outspoken in its call for arms control with a series of highly publicized arms reduction plans. The Soviets introduced in January a long-term programme for the elimination of nuclear arms in stages. Twice, in April and June, they put out proposals for the reduction of conventional weapons and forces in Europe. And they made repeated calls for a mutual end to nuclear testing.

Unable to compete with Moscow in this respect, the White House has been more reticent. It has, nonetheless, called for seperating the issue of strategic weapons from medium-ranged ones, while urging for a link in the reduction of weapons in Europe and Asia, maintaining that the Soviet Union has the upper hand in Asia. It also feels that there is a real danger that the United States will be behind its rival in both offensive and strategic defensive weapons. Therefore, ignoring the Soviet calls for a halt to nuclear testing, the United States goes on.

Debate over regional issues between the two superpowers has grown intense.

In the name of anti-terrorism the United States launched a military attack upon Libya and posed threats against Syria as a warning signal to the Middle East.

Equally active in th region, the Soviet Union has provided weapons to some Arab countries, while increasing contact with the Gulf nations and promoting a reconciliation between different factions within the Palestine Liberation Organization. It also has called for an international conference on the Middle East in order to further its influence in the region and contend with the United States.

In Central America, apart from offering military aid to the contras in Nicaragua, the White House has also employed dipiomatic means to pressure the ruling government to change course so as to restrict or diminish Soviet influence in the country.

Moscow has been concentrating on its economic problems at home while talking profusely about disarmament internationally. In regional rivalry, it continues to hold fast to its spheres of influence. Far from giving in, it is ready to expand wherever there is an opportunity.

Afghanistan is a case in point. Dissatisfied with mere military assaults on the resistance forces, the Soviets have replaced Karmal with Mohammad Najibullah as leader of the People's Democratic Party. They have also stepped up their pressure against Pakistan. As the United States has repeatedly claimed, the Soviet expedition in Afghanistan has been motivated by the rich Gulf oil fields to which Afghanistan is the pathway.

In Southeast Asia, while offering continuous support to Viet Nam's attempt to control Kampuchea, Moscow has turned down the 8-point peace proposal by the Coalition Government of Democratic Kampuchea. This has made it more obvious that the Soviet interest lies in expansionism in the South Pacific area.

/9317
CSO: 5200/4047

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET CHIEF OF STAFF ON JAPANESE SDI ROLE, SS-20'S

OW111453 Tokyo NHK Television Network in Japanese 1216 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Interview with Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, by NHK correspondent Iida in Moscow on 11 June -- recorded; interview conducted in Russian with Japanese subtitles; following is from Russian]

[Text] [Iida] If Japan takes part in the scientific research for SDI, what policies will the USSR adopt in relation to Japan?

[Akhromeyev] Perhaps the question of USSR policies toward Japan should be asked of someone else. I am not a political leader but a military person. I can, however, say one thing: In our opinion, Japan is acting incorrectly, for in practice it supports President Reagan's SDI; it appears Japan has not yet realized all the dangers of introducing attack weapons in space.

[Iida] What are the defence policies of the USSR in the Far East and Asian region?

[Akhromeyev] The policies of the Soviet Union, the defensive policies of the Soviet Union, in this region are essentially the same as they are in the rest of the world. The Soviet Union, in matter of its defense is doing nothing, nor does it wish to do anything, above that which is necessary to defend its fatherland and its state so that in all regions -- including the Far East, Asia, and Southeast Asia -- a military balance is maintained and peace is guaranteed.

[Iida] How can the expansion of the Soviet Armed Forces in the Far East be explained; for example, the deployment of SS-20's in the Far East and so forth.

[Akhromeyev] I do not think the Soviet forces are expanding in the Far East. In addition, the deployment of SS-20 rockets, as you said, in the Far East has not been done for a long time. But indeed, definite military forces of the Soviet Union, including a certain quantity of the SS-20 rockets, do exist in the East. But what is the Soviet Union to do if numerous military forces of the United States are being deployed in this region?

[Iida] Is Japan threatening the Soviet Union today?

[Akhromeyev] I think that Japan by itself is not threatening the Soviet Union today. But, as a matter of fact, Japan is tied by the relevant military treat with the United States. As a matter of fact, U.S. military forces are on Japanese territory. American aircraft are constantly in Japanese airspace, and in seas surrounding Japan, numerous American ships are to be found. I think the U.S. policies toward the Soviet Union are known to you. From these spring dangers to the Soviet Union from Japanese territory.

[Iida] Allow me to ask you one last question: What is your predecessor, Mr Ogarkov, engaged in? If possible, please explain concretely.

[Akhromeyev] Well, it is possible, thought it is not our custom to give too much emphasis to who our military leaders are and where they are working. Marshal of the Soviet Union Ogarkov is working in the Ministry of Defense and is one of our leading workers. He is performing responsible work and is continuing together with us to labor in order to support the defense capabilities of the Soviet Union on the level that is needed to ensure the security of our country.

[Iida] Thank you very much. It was very interesting.

[Akhromeyev] Thank you.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1441

SALT/START ISSUES

PRC JOURNAL VIEWS U.S.-SOVIET DISPUTE OVER SALT II

HK250918 Beijing LIAOWANG in Chinese No 24, 16 Jun 86 p 5

[Special dispatch from Washington by LIAOWANG contributing reporter Shi Lujia: "Reagan's Decision Has Caused a Great Disturbance"]

[Text] U.S. President Ronald Reagan announced on 27 May that since the Soviet Union had frequently violated the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II), the United States would not be bound by the treaty later this year. The Soviet Union reacted strongly to this decision. Some West European NATO allies expressed opposition or had reservations. Consequently, a rigorous trial lay ahead for U.S.-Soviet relations and U.S.-European relations.

SALT II was signed by the late Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev and former U.S. President Jimmy Carter in Vienna in 197? after 8 years of negotiations. After the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, the U.S. Senate refused to ratify the treaty. Although the treaty was "fundamentally flawed" and not ratified, the position of the Reagan administration was that the United States would comply with it so long as the Soviet Union does so. The United States reiterated this position at the expiration of the treaty at the end of last year.

When making the new announcement, Reagan decided to replace two old nuclear submarines with a new Trident with nuclear warhead missile launchers so as to keep the United States within the limits of SALT II. He said that the policy would not be effected for the time being, and whether the United States would adhere to the treaty depended on Soviet behavior in the following months. He urged the Soviet Union to stop violations of the treaty, reduce the pace of its arms expansion, and show sincerity at the Geneva nuclear disarmament talks. If the Soviet Union takes these "constructive steps," Reagan said that he would reconsider the decision already made. Even though the treaty is abrogated, he said, provided the Soviet Union is willing to exercise "mutual restraint," the number of strategic nuclear weapons deployed by the United States in the future will not exceed that of the Soviet Union.

The reaction from the Soviet Union was stern. In a 28 May commentary, the Soviet news agency TASS denied any violation and said that Reagan's assertions were groundless. The commentary also charged the United States with harboring a scheme to ensure a unilateral military advantage and said that the Soviet Union would take necessary countermeasures to engage in arms expansion. A few days later, Moscow warned in a sharply worded statement that the Soviet Union would no longer be bound by the two SALT treaties and would take "necessary measures to prevent the strategic equilibrium from being damaged" once Reagan

put his 27 May decision into effect. Soviet leaders also asked West European countries to persuade Reagan to reconsider his decision. During these days, Soviet officials emphasized time and again that the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit would be jeopardized and there would be an "adverse influence" on the Geneva nuclear disarmament talks so long as Washington maintained its hard stand against SALT II.

Following the U.S.-Soviet Geneva summit in November last year, the relations between the two countries seemed relaxed. In the first half of this year, however, both sides engaged in fierce wrangling on a series of issues. Although the Geneva nuclear disarmament talks have reached the fifth round since their resumption in March last year, no substantial progress has been made so far. Both sides have insisted on their respective positions and blamed the other for having no sincerity. Moscow announced on several occasions that it would make sustained efforts to unilaterally halt its nuclear tests and asked Washington to undertake the commitment, and also proposed a summit held as quickly possible on the issue, but Washington refused the offer. The Soviet Union cancelled the meeting of foreign ministers of the two big powers to be held in Washington in May this year, and has not yet decided on a new date because it asserted that the U.S. attack on Libya was "deliberately aimed at intensifying Soviet-U.S. relations." Both the United States and the Soviet Union hope that the second summit can be held within the year, but no agreement has been reached because the positions of both sides are poles apart. Public opinion in the West holds that the new quarrel on SALT II provoked under such circumstances will undoubtedly impair the trend of relaxation and further intensify the relations between the two countries.

Proceeding from their own interests and security, the West European countries require U.S. nuclear protection, but also fear that the vigorous arms expansion of the United States will stimulate the Soviet Union to engage in a new round of the arms race, which could result in a threat to Europe. For this reason, they hope that the United States and the Soviet Union can reach an agreement on maintaining a relatively strategic equilibrium. Although the West European countries are not satisfied with the nuclear arms limitation treaties concluded between the two big powers over the past decade or so, they believe that the treaties concluded are better than nothing at all.

Owing to pressure from U.S. allies and differences within his administration, Reagan did not hastily abrogate SALT II, which he opposed repeatedly during the presidential elections. The fact that Reagan suddenly changed his position has shocked the West European countries. At the conference of NATO foreign ministers held recently in Canada, the foreign ministers of U.S. allies unanimously requested the United States to reconsider the decision. The British Government, which holds identical views with the United States on many international issues, also issued a statement expressing regret over the decision.

The West European countries also expressed dissatisfaction with the United States for not consulting them before making the decision. They pointed out: Despite opposition from the majority of its allies, the United States attacked Libya in April. Now the United States has again ignored their consistent position and has taken this drastic action that involves the relations between East and West as a whole. This shows how far the United States has gone in acting willfully, regardless of its allies. In connection with the recent disputes between the United States and Europe in trade and other issues, some U.S. newspapers fear that Europe will further fall away from the United States in the days to come.

In view of Soviet counterattacks and criticism from Western Europe, U.S. Covernment officials came out one after another to explain that Reagan's new position is aimed at urging both the Soviet Union and the United States to exercise "mutual restraint," thus reaching a new agreement on sharply reducing nuclear arms. They also reminded people to take note of Reagan's promise that the number of nuclear weapons deployed by the United States in the future will not exceed that of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, it seems that these explanations cannot quell the great disturbance.

/9738
CSO: 5200/4048

SALT/START ISSUES

XINHUA: U.S. STRATEGIC GOAL SEEKS TO HINDER USSR DEVELOPMENT

OW270028 Beijing XINHUA Domestic Service in Chinese 0657 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Commentary by XINHUA reporter Mei Zhenmin: "U.S.-USSR Dispute Over the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty"]

[Text] Beijing, 25 Jun (XINHUA) -- U.S. President Reagan declared on 27 may that because the Soviet Union has failed to observe the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty [SALT II], the United States would no longer be bound by this treaty by the end of the year. Then, the Soviet Union warned that it would take "adequate, effective countermeasures," saying that it could not remain "unconcerned" over the U.S. action. The accord, which was signed in June 1979 after 300 talks over a period of 7 years, is now facing the danger of being abrogated.

Reviewing how this treaty was signed, we can see the changes in the relative nuclear strengths of the United States and the Soviet Union and their confrontation.

When Nixon visited the Soviet Union for the first time in July 1959 as vice president of the United States, U.S. nuclear strength was overwhelmingly superior to that of the Soviet Union by 10 to 1. Afterwards, the Soviet Union went all out to expand its military strength, taking advantage of the United States being bogged down in the Vietnam war. When Nixon visited the Soviet Union for the second time as U.S. President and signed the "provisional accord" of SALT I and the Antiballistic Missile Treaty with the Soviet Union in May 1972, the U.S. and Soviet nuclear strengths appeared to be the same. When President Carter and Brezhnev signed SALT II in Vienna in June 1979, the USSR had already exceeded the United States in strategic nuclear weapons launchers. According to official figures released by the two sides at that time, the Soviet Union had 2,504 launchers, and the United States had 2,283. The signing of the two accords indicated that the United States had already lost its nuclear superiority. Under such circumstances, the United States hoped to use the treaty to stop the growing nuclear strength of the Soviet Union which, after becoming equal to the United States in nuclear strength, also wanted to temporarily suspend its competition in quantity so as to concentrate on improving the quality of its nuclear weapons. Since both sides felt that the treaty would limit the other side in terms of quantity, but not quality, the deal was made.

After becoming the head of the White House in 1981, President Reagan decided to "restore national strength" and reverse the unfavorable situation in the arms race with the Soviet Union. In October of the same year after becoming President, he put forward plans to modernize U.S. strategic nuclear strength. Despite the staggering financial deficits, enormous military budgets were earmarked each year for the development and deployment of more advanced nuclear weapons. The current stage is one in which strategic nuclear weapons are being renewed.

According to a report by the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military situation in fiscal 1987, "all types of weaponry, from strategic arms to individual arms for ground combat, are being renewed," and "the United States will continue to give top priority to the renewal of its strategic weaponry." In a long article entitled "The U.S. Defense Strategy" published in the spring issue of the FOREIGN AFFAIRS quarterly, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger stressed: "As a result of rebuilding U.S. military strength, the conditions for U.S.-Soviet relations will be redefined."

As the Reagan administration sees it, the United States has now extricated itself from the "Quite unfavorable situation of weakness" during the 1970's and has regained its "status of relatively powerful strength." The Reagan government's declaration that it will abrogate SALT II precisely proceeds from its need to seek military superiority and its intention to "redefine U.S.-USSR relations."

While the United States worked hard to modernize its strategic nuclear strength, the Soviet Union also proceeded to renew its strategic nuclear weapons. Reagan declared his intention to abrogate the treaty mainly because, following the deployment of SS-25 ICBMs, the Soviet Union developed a new generation strategic offensive weapon, the SS-24 mobile ICBM, and violated the treaty in various other areas. However, according to U.S. papers, this was just a superficial reason. In actuality, the Reagan administration wanted to use this reason to press the Soviets to make substantial concessions at the Geneva disarmament talks. From a longer perspective, the U.S. strategic scheme is to hinder the Soviet Union with an even more gigantic nuclear arms race so as to deplete the USSR's financial and material resources, rendering it incapable of achieving its "accelerated development strategy" to expedite its economic, scientific, and technological development.

The Reagan administration's decision to abrogate the aforesaid treaty has caused concern and opposition from its allies and the U.S. people. During a recent meeting of NATO foreign ministers, the United States' Western European allies all strongly opposed abrogating the treaty. Many U.S. congressmen have openly stated that the treaty should be sustained. The house also adopted a resolution urging the Reagan administration to continue to abide by the treaty. Owing to this, some U.S. papers and journals have predicted that the Reagan administration will have trouble during the midterm election in November. Amid the voices of opposition at home and abroad, the U.S. Government itself has also showed differences and disconcerted steps. After the White House spokesman stated on 12 June that the treaty "no longer exists," Secretary of State Shultz made a denial the next day. After Gorbachev proposed on 16 June that as long as the United States agreed to abide by the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty for 15 years, the USSR would agree to cut the number of strategic nuclear weapons, Secretary of Defense Weinberger immediately rejected the proposal. However, in a speech at Glassboro on 19 June, Reagan praised the proposal, saying that the Soviet Union has "begun to make a serious effort," that "it could represent a turning point" in the arms-control talks, and that "this can be an opportunity for improving U.S.-Soviet relations."

Meanwhile, both the USSR and the United States have not slammed the door on a second summit. As the international situation continues to change, the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union will also be marked by frequent tension and relaxation according to their strategic and tactical needs. At any rate, the international community does not want to see a deterioration of the situation.

/9738
CSO: 5200/4048

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW DISCUSSES FRENCH NUCLEAR ARMS BEFORE MITTERAND'S VISIT

LD132214 Moscow in French to France and Belgium 1730 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Vitaliy Andreyev commentary]

[Excerpts] President Francois Mitterand will travel to the USSR in the first 2 weeks of July for an official visit, it was announced in Moscow and Paris. This visit will form part of the Soviet-French summit dialogue, already marked last October by an important event, Mikhail Gorbachev's trip to France. It would be no exaggeration to say that the dangerous international situation urgenly demands some responsible, well thought-out actions by all the states. The USSR and France, these two influential countries, permanent members of the UN Security Council, can contribute to the stabilization of the situation and a retreat from confrontation in favor of detente. What problems are at the origin of the special concerns of the Soviets and the French? Certainly, first of all, is that of curbing of the arms race and reducing nuclear potentials.

The USSR is in favor of a complete liquidation of nuclear weapons between now and the end of the century. Moscow does not limit itself to declarations of intent, but takes definite action in this direction. That is the case in particular of the Soviet unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, in force for nearly one year. The USSR first of all invites the United States and other nuclear powers, France included, to follow its example, because the stopping of nuclear tests means the cessation of the perfection of nuclear weapons.

Take another aspect of the Soviet program, the liquidation of medium-range missiles in Europe. It is necessary, to be sure, to agree above all on the reduction of Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons. However, it must not be forgotten that France possesses a considerable nuclear potential. France's will to guarantee her security has always met with the USSR's understanding. But today it is impossible to assure security by a continued increase of nuclear weapons. Thus, in the course of his visit to France, Mikhail Gorbachev proposed starting direct discussion on medium-range weapons.

Nobody is raising the question of France's unilateral disarmament; nobody is trying to compromise her security. But it is necessary to cut the Gordian knot, and the quicker the better. It is important to act progressively, taking into account the mutual interests. The first task is to prevent the extension of the arms race into space and [words indistinct] convinced partisan of the nondeployment of space strike weapons. According to the statements of President Mitterrand, France is aware of the dangers inherent in the Star Wars program. Nevertheless, there are in France some personalities, including officials, who would not refrain from associating Paris in this (?very) dangerous adventure, an act which would without a doubt contribute to the destabilizing of the international situation.

Europe constitutes the priority for Moscow and Paris. The USSR and France have an interest in stabilizing the climate on the European Continent and reducing the military confrontation. Objectively, their positions on these issues coincide. This coincidence must be translated into concrete actions. The same applies in the case of the regional roblems. The interests of the USSR and France [words indistinct]. Acting jointly or in parallel, Moscow and Paris could favor more than anything else, a political settlement of the conflicts and the complex situations.

In the USSR, the future of relations with France is looked at with optimism. The USSR and France belong, to be sure, to different military and political alliances; at times their interests diverge and are even opposed. Nevertheless, that does not prevent a wide dialogue, a constructive search for a solution to the problems, or cooperation. That is the USSR's constant approach in its relations with France.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1442

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA STRESSES IMPORTANCE OF BRITISH, FRENCH NUCLEAR ARMS

PM241312 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 86 First Edition p 6

[Yu. Viktorov article: "In the Interests of Common Security"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is doing its utmost to end the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and to remove the threat of a devastating war.

These efforts are based on a realistic program to emliminate nuclear weapons on earth by the end of this millenium. The series of specific measures includes a proposal to free Europe of American and Soviet medium-range missiles as early as the first phase of nuclear disarmament.

The urgency of this step is obvious. Military confrontation in Europe stands at a particularly high level. There are two major military-political groups -- NATO and the Warsaw Pact -- here, and colossal numbers of nuclear weapons have been stockpiled. The West European arsenals alone contain more than 7,000 nuclear combat munitions. These arsenals are being constantly updated and are becoming increasingly dangerous. New U.S. medium-range missiles are continuing to be sited on the territory of West European NATO countries.

States like Britain and France have also been embroiled in the nuclear arms race. Right now they could dispatch than 500 nuclear charges in a single launch.

Britain possesses 64 launchers for Polaris A3TK SLRM's capable of reaching targets at a distance of 3,500 km. The French nuclear forces consist of 18 silo-bases launchers for S-3 ballistic missiles with a range of 3,700 km and 6 missile-carrying atomic submarines in addition to airborne nuclear-weapon delivery vehicles. Five of these submarines are equipped with M-20 missiles with a range of 3,200 kilometers, and one with M-4 MIRV missiles (with a range of 4,500 km).

These states' nuclear armaments are being constantly modernized and built up. It is planned to reequip British missile-carrying submarines in the nineties with Trident-2 ballistic missiles purchased from the United States. The adoption of these missiles -- each carrying 8 warheads -- will increase the number of British nuclear charges carried on submarines by roughly 50 percent.

France intends to deploy mobile medium-range missile complexes in addition to its stationary medium-range missiles. A seventh submarine equipped with new M-5 ballistic missiles with a range of 6,000 km is being commissioned into the submarine fleet. Four more French submarines will be reequipped with M-4 missiles. Here the number of warheads on sea-launched missiles alone will almost double.

The total number of combat charges on British and French missiles could increase to around 1,200 by the mid-nineties. This fact objectively demonstrates that the USSR and the other Warsaw Pact countries cannot ignore the presence in Europe of the corresponding British and French nuclear arms. They have always been included in the balance of forces existing between the Warsaw Pact and NATO and been taken into consideration as a factor determining the strategic situation at the USSR-U.S. strategic arms limitation and reduction talks.

The substantial reduction of Soviet and American nuclear armaments capable of reaching each other's territory and the elimination of those states' medium-range missiles in Europe as early as the first phase proposed by the USSR nuclear disarmament program objectively raises the question of the corresponding British and French armaments.

The proportion of British and French nuclear arms within the correlation of forces increases the more significant proposed reductions of nuclear arms on the Soviet and American sides.

Persistently searching for the slightest opportunity to make nuclear disarmament problems susceptible of practical solutions, the Soviet Union has found it possible to tackle the question of medium-range nuclear missiles without linking it directly to space and strategic arms. Showing a constructive attitude and large-scale compromise in its proposals, it has agreed not to compensate itself for the number of combat charges possessed by Britain and France during the reduction of USSR and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe.

It is clear that in excluding the nuclear facilities possessed by America's NATO allies in Europe the USSR has the right to expect the United States to make a commitment to refrain from supplying its medium-range and strategic missiles to other countries and that Britain and France refrain from increasing the number of their own corresponding armaments. This is only fair, since otherwise the elimination of Soviet missiles could become essentially a unilateral measure and, effectively, unilateral disarmament. Such a measure would damage the security interests not only of the USSR but of its allies also.

However, with the aim of helping to free Europe of nuclear weapons, the USSR has taken a number of serious, practical steps in the recent past. In April 1985, a unilateral Soviet moratorium on deploying medium-range missiles in Europe and carrying out other countermeasures there was introduced. A considerable number of Soviet SS-20 missiles were taken off stand-by alert and their stationary installations dismantled.

In the struggle for nuclear disarmament the Soviet Union is persistently and creatively searching for new ways to achieve this lofty objective. This is shown by the proposal put forward by M.S. Gorbachev at his meeting with British parliamentarians on 26 May.

An official decision by Britain to eliminate its nuclear weapons would undoubtedly play a positive role in advancing toward an accord on medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. In response to this the Soviet Union would be ready to make an equivalent reduction in its own nuclear potential.

If at the same time all foreign nuclear weapons were also removed from British territory the Soviet Union would guarantee that its nuclear means would never be targeted on British territory and never be used against Britain. The whole range of questions arising here could be the subject of discussion and elaboration of agreed decisions between the USSR and Britain.

The implementation of this proposal could substantially influence the situation in Europe and provide a positive boost to resolving the problems of nuclear disarmament.

Although the new Soviet initiative is directly addressed to the British Government, it should be clear that its implementation would point the way toward the path that must be followed if the lofty aims enshrined in the nuclear disarmament program are to be attained. In other words, the Soviet proposal opens up prospects for joint or parallel acts to achieve a suitable [adekvatnyy] reduction in nuclear potentials.

Efforts on the part of all European countries to implement the Warsaw Pact states' proposals on reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe put forward at the Political Consultative Committee conference in Budapest could make an important contribution to normalizing the situation on the continent.

The appeal to NATO countries and all European states to reduce all components of ground troops and tactical strike aviation expresses the single will of the conference participants. These reductions would be implemented over the whole territory of Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. Operational-tactical nuclear armaments with a range (operational range) of up to 1,000 km would be subject to cuts at the same time as conventional armaments.

Putting these proposals forward negates the fabrications about a threat to the West from the Warsaw Pact if nuclear weapons are eliminated in Europe. They show once again the defensive nature of the Warsaw Pact states' military doctrine.

Mindful of the realities of the nuclear space age, when it is virtually impossible to build security just for oneself and when the security of each state or group of states depends on the security of others, the Soviet Union and the other socialist states are proposing specific political steps in the interests of common security.

The problem of confrontation on the European Continent, a problem not of the USSR's making, must be solved, and the sooner the better. The Soviet Union urges the European states to promote this.

The solution of the task of nuclear and other kinds of disarmament will depend in many respects on how the European states conduct themselves. It is very important that a first step be taken in Europe. It is clear to everyone that if the first, most difficult step is taken, both a second and third step will be taken. Mankind will see not a faint ray of hope but realistic prospects, not bellicose rhetoric but specific deeds in defense of peace, not the economic burden of militarism but the first fruits of disarmament.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1442

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW ON U.S. DEPLOYMENTS IN JAPAN

Okinawa Exercise

OW180629 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 17 Jun 86

[From "The World Today" program; presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] Large-scale landing exercises with the participation of Marines and warships of the U.S. Seventh Fleet have begun in the Japanese island of Okinawa. The Pentagon has decided to transfer another squadron of F-16 fighter bombers, capable of carrying nuclear weapons, to the U.S. air base in Honshu Island ahead of schedule. These are just two more facts among a multitude attesting to increasing U.S.- Japanese military potential.

In one of our reviews we cited a report by the Japanese newspaper AKAHATA that the armed forces of Japan and the United States were working out plans for a joint attack on the Soviet Kuril Islands and Sakhalin in case of so-called extraordinary circumstances. A number of additional details about these plans have come to light. According to the same newspaper, the commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, General Kelly, admitted for the first time in January, that the Pentagon, with the help of its allies, intended to strike a blow at Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands in the event, as he said, of a military flare-up in any other region, like central Europe for example.

According to reports from Tokyo, the area occupied by U.S. military bases on Hokkaido has tripled. The deployment of U.S. fighter and bomber aircraft in the north of Japan is going ahead at full speed. Provocative exercises for a strike group of U.S. ships are planned in the Sea of Japan.

It is appropriate to mention, in relation to this, that the United States has rejected our proposal to reduce, on the basis of parity, or better still to liquidate entirely, the Soviet and U.S. nuclear forces on the European Continent. It demands that the Soviet Union liquidate similar forces beyond the Urals, that is, in the Asian part of our country.

What does this mean? It turns out that the U.S.- Japanese militarists are actively arming themselves, whereas at the same time they would like to see complete disarmament on our side. Obviously, they will not live to see this. At their Budapest meeting, the Warsaw Pact member-states declared responsibly that they would never, under any circumstances, begin military actions against any state, be it in Europe or any other part of the world, provided they themselves were not objects of aggression.

This is our military doctrine. As far as the madmen who run around with plans to launch attacks against the Soviet Far East are concerned, well, the Soviet Union has more than enough strength to bring them to their senses.

F-16's to Misawa

OW211003 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 20 Jun 86

[Dmitriyev commentary: "Why is the Pentagon in Such a Hurry?"]

[Text] According to a KYODO report, the United States plans to complete deployment of F-16 fighter bombers to the Misawa base 1 year earlier than originally scheduled. This has been revealed by General Ellis in a congressional public hearing. Our commentator Dmitriyev writes as follows:

The Pentagon is working to complete the deployment of F-16's to Misawa 1 year earlier than originally scheduled. Why is it in such a hurry? An excuse the United States always uses to justify its war preparations is what it terms "Soviet military buildups." However, Soviet leader Mr Gorbachev reaffirmed at a plenum of the CPSU Central Committee held several days ago in Moscow that the USSR will not increase the number of its intermediate-range missiles in Asia. Consequently, the so-called Soviet threat cannot be a reason this time, as it could not be in previous ca es. Why, then, is the Pentagon in such a hurry?

It must probably be seeking to complete one project and quickly move on to the next. Details of the next project are already known. According to General Ellis, the United States plans to build a munitions magazine in Msawa. Furthermore, it will not ask Japan to share the cost of the projected construction. What makes it so generous? General Ellis made it clear that the facility will be for offensive purposes. In reality, however, the U.S. military presence itself in Japan is totally for offensive purposes.

The United States maintains more than 100 military bases and facilities in Japan and has nearly 50,000 military personnel stationed there. The overall mission of this military power is by no means to defend Japan against any nonexistent threat. The mission is to keep its sights on the Far Eastern region of the USSR and on other socialist countries and developing countries and to launch attacks at an initial stage of what Washington considers an emergency, if such a situation develops. The Pentagon simply does not care what may happen to those bases following such attacks, because having retaliatory attacks directed to those bases far away from the continental United States is what U.S. strategists are planning. Misawa Air Force Base is the most naked symbol of the agressive intention of the U.S. military presence in Japan.

If Japan is an unsinkable aircraft carrier for the United States as the Pentagon believes, F-16's deployed in Misawa form its major offensive power. Those fighter bombers are nuclear capable and have Soviet territories within their range; their mission is to carry out bombings or even nuclear attacks against the Soviet Union. U.S. military representatives repeatedly made statements to that effect.

Are such weapons necessary for Japan's defense? Would the Japanese people feel that they are more secure with these weapons deployed on a base in their country? We doubt it.

During his recent meeting with Japanese Foreign Minister Abe, General Secretary Gorbachev said that it is strange that Japan says nothing about U.S. nuclear missiles targeted on the eastern region of the USSR while complaining about Soviet missiles in Asia. The Soviet position has been proven correct by the report that 50 F-16's, which are nuclear capable, will be deployed to Misawa sometime this year. At a time when the USSR has reaffirmed its position of not increasing the number of its missiles in Asia, the United States is building up its offensive power in Japan in haste. This U.S. deed makes one think anew about from where the real threat to peace and security in the Far East comes.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1442

BRIEFS

TASS ON 'TOMAHAWK' TEST--New York, 15 Jun (TASS)--A spokesman for the U.S. Navy reported that another test of the "Tomahawk" cruise missile equipped with MIRV'ed warheads was conducted in the south-west of the U.S. A missile launched by a mobile booster from a military base in California, flew at a low altitude for over 300 miles to the test site White Sands, New Mexico, hitting a member of targets by its warheads. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 15 Jun 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1442

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: U.S. CONTINUING 'SECRET' CW RESEARCH

LD170616 Moscow TASS in English 0607 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] New York June 17 TASS -- TASS correspondent Maxim Knyazkov reports:

The newspaper "PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER" has learnt that Thomas Jefferson University in Philadelphia had been awarded 4.3 million dollars by the Pentagon to set up a centre for the study of toxins.

Though the leaders of the new centre are seeking to assert that investigations will be of purely academic nature, the very fact of the Pentagon's participation shows the reverse. Local observers point out that it is another evidence of the fact that the Reagan administration is continuing secret explorations to develop and stockpile bacteriological weapons in violation of the 1925 Geneva protocol and the 1972 U.N. convention, which banned these arms.

Thomas Jefferson University is not the only higher educational establishment in the USA used by the Pentagon to implement this sinister programme. In 1984 it was reported at a peace conference in Baltimore that a laboratory of Maryland State University received an order from the Pentagon to investigate into influence of the typhoid virus on man.

According to the U.S. press, the USA has been conducting for over 30 years secret work on developing bacteriological weapons. A laboratory of the U.S. Department of the Army situated in Fort Detrick (Maryland state) has become one of the main centres of this work. It was actively engaged in investigations of viruses of anthrax, encephalitis, plague and other acute diseases.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: U.S. TURNING 'BLIND EYE' TO LEAKING CHEMICAL WEAPONS DEPOTS

LD120925 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] New York, 11 Jun (TASS)--The U.S. authorities turn a blind eye to dangerous dumps of obsolete armaments, also of chemical weapons, that were left by the U.S. military all over the territory of the United States and that pose a serious hazard for the population. This is indicated again by the facts of criminal negligence with regard to such "burials" of lethal arms from the Environmental Protection Agency, the facts that came to light. Information was leaked into the press that one of the laboratories of the agency which is called upon to eliminate possible sources of contamination of the environment has been situated for many years in Edison, New Jersey, on the territory that was formerly an army depot, and that is contaminated with toxic substances and radiation.

The "Raritan" army arsenal was situated there from 1917 to 1964. Ammunition, explosives and chemical weapons were kept there. Turning over that plot of land to other agencies, the Pentagon saw no need for spending on removing obsolete armaments, posing mortal danger, beyond the limits of one of the most densely populated states of the U.S. For the sake of appearances these armaments were buried on the spot. The federal and local authorities did not interfere in the affairs of the military, and thus showed most criminal connivance. As the newspaper PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER writes, some ten hundred people now work on the territory that was formerly an army dump, and where huge canisters with toxic gas, chemical bombs, containers with toxic substances are rusting underground. The source of an enhanced radiation, twice or thrice the normal level, has not yet been established.

And enhanced radiation was discovered by chance, when one of the laboratory's employees decided to show to his colleagues a G-M counter and it started sounding an alarm signal.

Even now that these facts evoked protests of the public, the Environmental Protection Agency refuses to do anything to remove the chemical weapons dump. Instead of that is hastened to declare that the scope of contamination in Edison gives no ground for concern. Nevertheless, according to press reports, even the U.S. Department of Defense regards this noxious dump one of the most dangerous among the 7,000 such "burial places" of obsolete armaments left by the military in various areas of the United States.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: PRESS CONFERENCE AT USIA SEEKS TO JUSTIFY U.S. CW BUILDUP

LD131645 Moscow TASS in English 1300 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, 13 Jun (TASS)--With protests mounting in the United States and abroad against the U.S. Administration's dangerous plans to start massively building up arsenals of chemical weapons, official Washington is trying, cost what it may, to "substantiate" and "justify" its dangerous actions.

A press conference, held at the United States Information Agency (USIA), was a stage in that campaign. Taking part in the conference were Deputy Assistant Defense Secretaries Thomas Welch and Douglas Fait.

Representatives of the U.S. Defense Department asserted that the decision on the buildup of American arsenals of chemical weapons is attributed to the impasse at the negotiations on that problem within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. And hence the conclusion that the United States can without a twinge of conscience create new generations of chemical weapons.

This is a distorted logic, indeed. It is exactly through the fault of the United States that all efforts that have been undertaken and are being undertaken with a view of banning and eliminating chemical weapons were brought to zero. Suffice it to recall that Washington unilaterally interrupted bilateral Soviet-American negotiations on that problem which took place on the USSR's initiatives in 1976-1980.

Beneath criticism is also another "argument" in favor of building up chemical arsenals, which says that such a buildup is necessary to the United States in order to... reduce the probability of a nuclear war in Europe.

The U.S. arsenals of chemical toxic agents have now reached great proportions. According to the press, the United States has 150,000 tons of warfare agents and 3 million toxic gas shells. And therefore nobody can be misled by the U.S. Administration's attempts to find a pretext for a still greater buildup of these arsenals, meanwhile refusing to take a constructive stand in the question of prohibition of chemical weapons.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW TV DISCUSSES CW DANGERS TO FRG

LD222007 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 22 Jun 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Gennadiy Gerasimov]

[Excerpts] [Gerasimov] Forty-five years have gone by. In remembering 1941, we are not going to repeat the mistakes of those textbook generals who prepared for the war by preparing for the last war, not the next one. The idiocy of trench warfare was the surprise brought by World War I. Europe put its young people through the mincing-machine of trench warfare. Under the impressions produced by this senseless carnage, Romain Rolland then called for an international peace to be created. The surprise of World War II was the mobile crematoria in the form of mass bombings of Hamburg, Dresden, and Tokyo and also the reduction to ashes of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Bertrand Russell, the British philosopher, and Albert Einstein, the U.S. scientist, issued a manifesto under the impression produced by this madness and called upon people to learn how to think in a new way.

But so far people are not thinking in a new way, and one of the reasons why is to be found in the burden of familiar ideas. In the past, more always meant better: more elephants in ancient times; more sabers in times not quite so ancient; more guns during the last war; and more soldiers at all times. Does this still hold true today? For example, is it necessary today to accumulate chemical weapons? Would it not be more sensible to reject them?

Those in the Pentagon who admire chemical weapons point out their special qualities: Present-day nerve gases work with certainty and leave no wounded so there is less suffering on the part of the victims and fewer things for those around them to worry about. A convincing balance-sheet. But the United States is not going to put these weapons into operation in its own country, they have been made for Europe.

[Correspondent Vladimir Kondratyev] What has to be done in order to deliver Europe from one of the most dangerous means of mass destruction this century? This question was discussed at a conference at the University of Mainz. Those involved were social democrats, trade unions, prominent scientists in the FRG and public organizations that oppose the presence of chemical weapons on their country's territory. Nowhere in the world is there as large a concentration of them as in the FRG.

U.S. military strategy does not envisage these weapons being used on its own territory. In the Pentagon's plans the role of bridgehead in any war of chemical destruction is given to Europe, and primarily to the Federal Republic. Inconsistency is the distinctive feature of the position taken by the FRG on this issue. In what it says the government advocates a world having a smaller quantity of weapons, including chemical weapons. In fact, Bonn has given the green light to the commencement of binary weapon production and has set the example for Washington's other NATO allies. At the same time, in order to pacify the public that was alarmed by this step, the ruling circles of the United States and the FRG agreed on a maneuver to divert attention.

This is Rheinland-Pfalz, one of the most picturesque parts of the country as far as landscape is concerned. It is a favorite spot for tourists. It is difficult to believe that silent death lurks in these thick forests. A U.S. military base is in the village of Fischbach.

Behind barbed wire, under conditions of total secrecy, is almost the whole U.S. arsenal of chemical weapons on the continent. It is estimated here that the stocks range between 5,000 and 10,000 metric tons, enough to wipe out 3 billion people at one time. Some of the chemicals have already been stored at Fischbach for decades.

This is accompanied by the danger of leaks and contamination of wide areas. The Americans have thus decided to remove the obsolete weapons, subsequently replacing them with the improved binary version. Bonn is trying to depict this as a concession by the United States to its own wishes. A statement was also made that binary weapons will be deployed only during so-called crisis situations. No one here knows exactly what is hidden behind this wording. Washington can use virtually any provocation like the recent one against Libya in order to justify the stocking of binary weapons. Furthermore it will be virtually impossible to monitor this process. As was pointed out at the Mainz conference, if one of the components is sited at Kreuznach and the other at Kaiserslautern, it will be impossible to prove the presence of weapons that could be prepared for action at any moment.

The fears of FRG residents are not groundless. It has become known that three points for deployment of the new binary weapons have been chosen in Rheinland-Pfalz, North Bavaria, and in place of the Fischbach base. The chemical death production-lines are due to start operating soon in the United States. As in the case with the Pershing and cruise missiles, hopes are being placed on the principle of produce and deploy first, and then hold talks from a position of strength. But more and more people in the FRG believe that a totally different approach is needed, or else the problem of chemical weapons will never be resolved.

A press conference on chemical weapons took place in Washington a few days ago. It was said that these have to be produced because the Soviet Union allegedly has a superiority in chemical weapons and also because -- and this is the main thing -- these are new weapons of improved quality. Here, if you please, one clearly sees the second reason for the arms race. The first reason, you remember, was the thinking inherited from the past that the more weapons there are the better it is: the second reason is the calculation that the more effective the weapons are the better it is. This is temptation by technology. Oscar Wilde considered that the best way of getting rid of temptation was to give into it. This is what they are doing, they are giving in to it. The mechanism works like this; the technology makes new weapons possible; profits to be made make them something to be desired; and cabinet strategy declares them to be essential.

Now about the references made at the Washington press conference to Soviet superiority in chemical weapons, and also in missiles, tanks, under nearly every heading: This is all one great lie. This was discussed -- it was mentioned again on 20 June -- at the joint session of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

A book appeared recently in New York. The book is called "The Myth of Soviet Military Supremacy." It is written by Tom Gervasi, the director of the Military Studies Center in New York. He draws two conclusions: first, using the figures he proves that there is no Soviet supremacy; and second, putting aside these figures he proves that there is no military significance in nuclear arithmetic. He writes that many Americans must ask themselves the following question: What are we going to do with supremacy if we achieve it? No one has yet suggested an answer to this important question. The reason, maybe, is that those who know the answer know that there is no such thing as military supremacy, that today all one can do is constantly build up military might, but that no matter how much of it one does build up it will never give nuclear power the ability to force another to submit to someone else's will.

What, then, are the reasons for the senseless rush toward the abyss? We have already mentioned an incorrect idea of the importance of quantitative and qualitative parameters in our nuclear age.

All the same, the author of this book writes, all the same there is a third reason that has to be recognized: the fact that arms production is the most profitable sector of the U.S. economy. The arms business, like any other, or like a cancer cell, strives to grow and, Gervasi writes, it exaggerates the armaments requirements in order to justify its growth, exaggerating the threat that they have to withstand. Thus progress is warped, it works to people's detriment instead of to their benefit. Prometheus gave people fire. They used this fire to keep warm and to cook their food. Then they discovered the auto-da-fe and invented napalm. Finally they split the atom. To begin with, its forces were released to do great damage to people: then they began to tame it. This is a difficult but necessary thing to do, and if it is done by joint efforts it is easier.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IZVESTIYA NOTES SPANISH TV SHOW ON U.S., UK CBW RESEARCH

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Apr 86 p 5

[Article by V. Vernikov, IZVESTIYA Madrid Correspondent: "Fort Detrich: Dangerous Virus"]

[Text] Reporting entitled, "The Secret Biological Threat," was shown on [Teleobyektiv], a popular spanish television program. The discussion about the stepped up development of biological weapons by the U. S. militarists and intelligence services [spetssluzhby] literally terrorized the television audience, exactly as several years ago Americans themselves were shocked by what was taking place in their country. Truly, none of them knew that special Pentagon elements had tested new types of bacteriological weapons on experimental rabbits, on passengers in an airport in Washington, on the New York Metro, in barracks, cafe's and other places where people congregate, and then in aerosol form sprayed them over San Francisco Bay, infecting thousands of people, although it was possible to document only the death of one person, (E. Nevin), a participant in the operation.

These and other facts which the television film discusses confirm with complete reliability that the U. S. began systemic research on development and use of chemical and bacteriological weapons during World War II. In later years the Americans involved former nazi scientists in this work, as well as Japanese specialists from the infamous "Detachment 731," which tested its barbarous "discoveries" on prisoners of war. The production of bacteria and viruses of typhus, cholera, tuberculosis, bubonic plague, smallpox, dysentery and many other most dangerous diseases was carried out in specialized centers such as, for example, Fort Detrich, Maryland and Dougway Proving Grounds, Utah. It is there that even today intensive experiments are being conducted with one of the most dangerous and toxic viruses of Anthrax, which was transferred to the Americans by Japanese researchers after "Detachment 731" was revealed.

The film also recalls that the U. S., along with Great Britain, at the very height of the war carried out at the same location, Fort Detrich, and in the British Biological Weapons Center in Porton-Down (southeast England) in parallel with Japanese fanatics, efforts to create bombs filled with spores of Anthrax. These spores remain in an active state for approximately 100 years and are capable of destroying any living organism. One of the bombs was

tested on the island of Greenard in the north of Scotland. It's first victims were a herd of sheep, which began to die already the next day, and shepherds, who died from lung ailments on the second and third day, which forced the British authorities to close Greenard altogether for living and even visiting for many decades, all the way to the present time.

William Basil, leader of a center at Fort Detrich, discusses "Teleobyektiv:"

"Yes, a secret program for creating bacteriological weapons was begun here during World War II. Several types of weapons were created then, but were not used in the war. Today's efforts, including those with the Anthrax virus, are being carried out within the framework of a super-secret program under the code name, "MK-Ultra," and one of the main aims of the experiments is to use viruses to control the psyche of people, paralyze their will, and as a result destroy them," he asserted. "There is no antidote to the Anthrax virus and an individual infected with it is doomed."

In 1969, under pressure of international public opinion, President Nixon was forced officially to ban work on the development of bacteriological weapons in the U. S. However, in fact they did not cease for a single day. As the Spanish journalists prove, since the current Washington administration came into power these works have begun to be carried out still more intensively, under the pretext of the need to conduct them for "purely defensive and research purposes." It is precisely then that tremendous new allocations from the federal budget were also allocated.

"In our reporting we reconstructed events through documents, both rather long ago and quite recent," discusses the film's author, the well known Spanish television journalist, Baltasar Margo, director of the "Teleobyektiv" program. "We were aided by the fact that two years ago the question of the production of chemical and bacteriological weapons in the U. S. was discussed in the American Senate after a well-known scandal in Canada, when unexpectedly facts came to life about the testing of toxic substances on sick people in one of the hospitals in Montreal.

This took place, continues Margo, in 1984 within the framework of Project Number 68 of the "MK-Ultra" program. But we had hardly started to speak about this with Pentagon officials, trying to obtain any sort of new information, when we understood that our undertaking was not a simple one. First, this was because none of those sick survived. Second, the results were so adroitly entangled by the American intelligence services, that not even the names were preserved of the narcotics and bacteriological substances with which totally unsuspecting people were inoculated, we were assured, and, moreover, their names had also disappeared without a trace. Third, even the Canadian lawyer (Joseph Rau) hired by the relatives of the victims, refused to give us their names, which, of course, he knows. He cited a special decision by the U. S. Congress which prohibited dissemination of more detailed information about this scandal in which the CIA and the Pentagon turned out to be involved.

Nevertheless, the Spanish television filming group succeeded in obtaining unique sequences, which recorded the moment this matter was heard in the U. S. Senate, at which then CIA director Colby finally was forced to acknowledge

that American "knights of the cloak and dagger" had violated all existing laws, flouted the presidential veto and operated on the territory of another country, without informing its government, the hospital doctors or the sick themselves. At the Senate sessions it was also stated aloud for the first time that the CIA was involved in attempts to murder leading political figures of foreign states which it objected to, and to undertake bacteriological warfare against Cuba on the territory of which bacteria and viruses of hog cholera, dengue fever, smallpox and other dangerous diseases were sprayed.

Former CIA employee Scott Barnes talks to "Teleobyektiv:"

"At one time the leadership assigned me to test the action and effectiveness of several types of bacteriological weapons in Central America," he asserts. "Before this for many years I engaged in fabricating evidence about the supposed instances of the use of these weapons by the Soviet Union in Laos and Kampuchea. I am prepared to present secret documents and instructions from my chiefs on this account to any authoritative commission or organization which is independent of the U. S. government."

"When we accidentally 'got lost' in the American Fort Detrich Center," states B. Magro, "where we were allowed to take only landscape shots, on the gates of one of the prohibited zones we saw a warning tablet: 'Danger! Anthrax -- Active Virus.' Unfortunately, we were interfered from filming this tablet, but we saw with our own eyes that which we were attempting to do: To prove that the U. S. is continuing to create new types of bacteriological weapons, not at all for defensive purposes."

Bruce Morrison, Congressman from Connecticut, talks to "Teleobyektiv:"

"During the past two years congress has repeatedly rejected attempts by President Reagan to increase openly the production of chemical and bacteriological weapons. Unfortunately, the President did not hear our voice and it is entirely obvious, since in the current budget more funds have been allocated for these purposes than ever before. Just the same we hope that he will not succeed in circumventing us. Congress has the authority to decide what activity the army or the Department of Defense is allowed to conduct, but, unfortunately, we lack the capability to control the implementation of these decisions. And this is extremely dangerous."

The film particularly emphasizes that U. S. activity in the field of biological weapons is a violation of a number of the most important international legal documents, and in particular of the convention on prohibiting the development, production and stockpiling of reserves of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and about their destruction (1972). The final sequences of the film sound like a warning: "The threat of biological war is just as dangerous as that of nuclear war. With but one difference: much less is known about it." The Spanish television journalists did everything possible so that more would be known.

9069
CSO: 5200/1397

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: CHEMICAL WEAPONS SEMINAR SPONSORED BY DUTCH GOVERNMENT

Seminar Opens

LD041407 Moscow TASS in English 1242 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] The Hague, 4 Jun (TASS)--An international seminar on problems of chemical arms control opened here today. It is attended by delegations from 45 countries. The Soviet delegation is led by the representative of the USSR to the UN Conference on Disarmament, Viktor Israelyan.

The purpose of the seminar is to give a new additional impetus to the talks on the prohibition of chemical weapons. The delegates will concentrate attention on main factors hindering the signing of a comprehensive treaty on the prohibition of chemical weapons, and discuss measures of verification and monitoring of the production of chemicals at civilian enterprises.

The government of Holland is the initiator of the three-day seminar. It would like to demonstrate in practice how multi-purpose chemical production can be submitted to monitoring offering the example of the existing national verification procedure the principles of which could be used in possible international agreements.

European Opposition to CW Noted

LD062215 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Eduard Kovalev commentary]

[Text] An international seminar on chemical weapons has ended in the Hague in which a Soviet delegation also took part. Here is a Mayak commentary. International affairs journalist Eduard Kovalev is at the microphone.

[Kovalev] The speeches of the participants in the seminar in The Hague showed that the European people are deeply worried about the latest U.S. plans to saturate the territory of the NATO countries with new types of chemical weapons, in particular binary ones. It is well known that the Pentagon has planned the modernization of U.S. chemical weapons already located in Europe.

Referring to a sort of U.S. lagging behind in the field of chemical weapons, Washington officialdom has set in motion the claim of the necessity of upgrading chemical weapons in Europe. Thus, the United States wants to complete with chemical weapons the notorious NATO military triad that includes conventional, tactical nuclear and strategic nuclear weapons.

European public representatives and activists of the antiwar movement point to the fact that the dangerous nature of chemical weapons put them on a level with other means of mass extermination. The Europeans are keenly aware of the fatal role chemical weapons, in particular binary weapons which at present are being forced on the NATO allies of the United States, can play in their densely populated continent.

For Europe, they can serve perfectly as a first-strike weapon, equal to nuclear weapons. Such a prospect is giving rise to energetic, broad counteraction in West European countries. The Netherlands and Denmark have already spoken against deploying binary weapons on their territory. Greece is coming out to keep the Balkans free of chemical weapons. Finally, several days ago, the Belgian parliament, in spite of the decision of the Belgian Government, turned down by 109 votes to 73 the planned deployment of the latest chemical weapons on its territory.

The parliamentarians called upon the governments of Belgium and of the other NATO partners to aspire to an international agreement that would place a total ban on the production and use of chemical weapons. At the seminar in The Hague, the position of the Soviet Union and of the other countries of the socialist community was understood. This position is most clear. Let us remind you of the fact that we are consistently struggling for a total stoppage of the production of chemical weapons, for the quickest possible and total elimination of these weapons and of the industrial basis for their production, and for a final and unreserved ban on chemical weapons.

Verification Discussed

LD061949 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Text] The Hague June 6 TASS -- An international seminar of experts on banning chemical weapons was held here on June 4-6. It was organized by the Netherland's Foreign Ministry. The aim of the seminar is to promote the development of methods of verification of keeping from production of chemical weapons at enterprises of the chemical industry in the context of the talks on a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons underway at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

Taking part in the seminar were delegations of 46 countries, among them the delegation of the Soviet Union led by USSR representative at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament Viktor Israelyan. The Soviet delegation emphasized the new large-scale Soviet proposals aimed at an early conclusion of a convention to eliminate by the end of the current century one of the most horrible kinds of weapons of mass destruction.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FRG AGREES WITH U.S. ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

Government Defends NATO Vote

LD151643 Hamburg DPA in German 1509 GMT 15 May 86

[Text] Bonn, 15 May (DPA)--The Federal Government is saying "yes," through NATO, to the production by the United States of new chemical weapons, aimed at bringing increased pressure on the Soviet Union to agree to a worldwide ban on chemical weapons. The Federal Government used this short formula in the Bundestag today to defend its NATO vote and the special agreement with the Americans. Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) and Defense Minister Manfred Woerner (CDU) pointed out the fact that the United States has renounced production since 1969, whereas the Soviet Union, Woerner said, has meanwhile increased its stock "to several (?hundred thousand) metric tons."

Spokesman for the opposition attacked the government's account as covering up a new round of arming. "At some point one must say no," said SPD disarmament expert Egon Bahr, who rejected agreement with the NATO armed forces objective [streitkraefteziel], because this would mean that for the first time Bonn would have joint responsibility for a new round in the arms spiral.

This armed forces objective notes that the new production of chemical weapons lies in the West's defense interest. Only after agreement will the U.S. Congress approve the new production of binary chemical weapons from 1 December 1987, if a worldwide and verifiable total ban cannot be negotiated with the Soviet Union by then. But this chance was described as "unfortunately doubtful" by CDU Deputy Karl Lamers from the experience of disarmament so far.

All spokesmen, however, welcomed the German-American agreement to withdraw from the Federal Republic--the only country where they are stationed--the old stocks of JUSA [expansion unknown] poison gas--regarded as particularly dangerous, which are apparently stored in the Rhineland Palatinate. No German Federal Government has ever achieved what Chancellor Kohl was able to agree with President Reagan, Woerner said that is: 1. Withdrawal of the old chemical weapons; 2. introduction of new weapons only with German agreement; and 3. that such weapons will no longer be stationed exclusively in the Federal Republic.

There would not be a deployment exchange--"new for old," promised Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, who was present in Tokyo when Kohl and Reagan

reached agreement on the withdrawal of old chemical weapons and the right of veto on storing new weapons. Genscher stressed he hope that the Soviet Union, which as a result of the stop in production [by the United States] has been "at an (advantage) for 17 years," would be ready for negotiations on a worldwide and controlled ban, now that Gorbachev had spoken for the first time of verification possibilities.

As a result of the government decision the door was being opened to a worldwide arms drive with new binary chemical weapons, noted Karsten Voigt, foreign affairs spokesman for the SPD Bundestag group. The SPD wants to keep at least Europe free from chemical weapons over the long term. Voigt expressed mistrust about the government's assertions about the possibilities of objecting to new weapons, and said that there already existed other contingency plans. A strategy of chemical retaliation is contrary to German interests. In the view of his parliamentary group colleague Hermann Scheer, following the German NATO vote the use of means of mass destruction in Europe had only become more likely. Bonn is presenting not a disarmament package "but a pack of tricks."

Chancellor Kohl has reintroduced the idea of calling an international conference to discuss joint measures that would guarantee a higher level of safety in nuclear power plants and more stringent safeguards against the involuntary release of radioactive substances from nuclear power plants in the event of an accident. The message recalls that the FRG proposal falls within the framework of the initiatives on which the Italian Government is also working. It reintroduces the idea put forth by Craxi in Tokyo at the end of the summit of the seven most industrialized Western countries.

Greens Deputy Torsten Lange accused the Federal Government of speaking untruths. The old stocks of chemical weapons were not being withdrawn for disarmament reasons but because they had become technically completely unsafe and dangerous to their guards. "Chemical waste management is not chemical disarmament, particularly when it goes hand in hand with modernization." If the Federal Government agrees to the so-called NATO armed forces target it makes itself jointly responsible for a new round in the arms drive.

The Bundestag welcomed the agreement between Kohl and Reagan in a resolution passed with the CDU/CSU coalition groups' majority. The resolution affirms the goal of achieveing a worldwide ban on chemical weapons as soon as possible.

Woerner Comments

DW160828 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 180 GMT 15 May 86

[Excerpt from speech by Defense Minister Manfred Woerner during the Bundestag debate on U.S. chemical weapons--recorded]

[Text] The United States will no longer insist on its rights emanating from the 1954 troop stationing treaty as far as chemical weapons are concerned. That is a considerable political gain for our sovereignty. That also spells the end of singularizing the FRG as the only European NATO country on whose

soil chemical weapons are stockpiled. That will come to an end. And finally, the chemical weapons that are to be withdrawn from the FRG by no later than 1992, if the final manufacturing stage in the United States can begin in December 1987, will not be replaced.

Proposals for zones free from chemical weapons in parts of Europe are not suitable substitutes for the discontinuation of chemical armament under an agreement that would reliably eliminate all types of chemical weapons, all depots, and all manufacturing facilities.

/12913
CSO: 5200/2690

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FRG PAPER CITES NATO CONCERN ABOUT BONN'S POSSIBLE VETO RIGHT

DW121047 Bonn DIE WELT in German 13 May 86 p 5

[C. Graf Brockdorff article: "NATO Concerned About Bonn's Veto Over C-Weapons"]

[Excerpt] Brussels--The reported agreement between Chancellor Kohl and President Reagan on chemical weapons is considered problematic by NATO. Military circles call it "not thoroughly thought out" and as "possibly having grave consequences." The presence of U.S. troops in Germany is involved.

Granting the right to decide on deployment of chemical weapons in Europe in a crisis cannot be limited to the FRG, it was said. The right claimed by the FRG must also be granted to other countries. In that connection the Netherlands and Denmark were mentioned.

The situation creates the danger that in an emergency the FRG would be left alone by the alliance partners, should weak governments veto the deployment of chemical weapons in Europe. "The singularizing" Bonn wants to avoid, would thus be supported in practice.

The starting point of the criticism is the need for chemical deterrence. According to military opinion, it alone is effective in keeping an adversary from using nerve gas against the West. It could only be implemented if U.S. chemical weapons were available in Europe in an emergency. Should that not be the case, nuclear weapons would have to be used.

The reason for the agreement between Kohl and Reagan, which has not yet officially been confirmed, was the U.S. Congress demand that NATO agree to U.S. forces targeting for chemical weapons deterrence. It was envisaged that the United States would resume production of chemical weapons, which was discontinued two decades ago.

/12913
CSO: 5200/2690

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FRG NEWSPAPER COMMENTS ON NATO CBW DECISION

DW230847 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 23 May 86 p 3

[Ulrich Mackensen editorial: "On the Old Track"]

[Excerpts] The decision of the North Atlantic alliance to approve the production of new chemical weapons by the United States causes discomfort.

Negotiations have been in progress in Geneva for quite some time to ban chemical weapons. But the superpowers obviously are not really interested in their elimination. Consequently, the Europeans ultimately will again be left holding the bag. It is no consolation that chemical weapons were not used in World War II even though both sides had them, because the two sides realized that such weapons also affect the user.

Actually, people with common sense would have expected a different development, what with the Chernobyl catastrophe. They could have expected, for example, a consideration of the question whether nuclear deterence can "work" at all, considering the effect of the use of nuclear weapons on "friend" and "foe" alike—an effect similar to that of chemical weapons. It would presumably be interesting to have public opinion pollsters ascertain the impact of Chernobyl on the credibility of nuclear deterrence. The conclusion then would have to be how such a strategy could be replaced with another, at least on a medium-term basis.

Instead, NATO has approved the production of chemical weapons and thereby intensifies the uncertainty of and insecurity of the people. The alliance missed its chance of stepping out of the well-worn tracks for a change and to test whether or not Washington would have been prepared to withdraw its corroded chemical weapons from the Federal Republic without anything in return. In the face of that development the NATO appeal for complete disarmament of chemical weapons looks like sheer mockery.

/12913
CSO: 5200/2690

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR'S ISRAELYAN SPEAKS ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

Press Conference at CD

AU191256 Paris AFP in English 1251 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Excerpt] Geneva, June 19 (AFP) -- The Soviet Union does not intend to produce new chemical arms and will hold talks with the United States next month about halting their production altogether and destroying those in stock, top Soviet disarmament negotiator Viktor Israelyan said here Thursday.

Mr. Israelyan also told journalists after a session of the disarmament conference in Geneva that Washington, which recently announced it would resume production of chemical arms, already had the world's largest chemical arsenal.

He said the U.S. arsenal contained 55 million tonnes of those arms, but stressed that Moscow would not be pressured by the U.S. decision to resume production of chemical arms, reportedly after a 17-year lapse.

Mr. Israelyan also said his talks Wednesday with British officials in London on reducing chemical arms arsenals had been "serious and very tense".

In Bonn with Kvitsinskiy

LD142120 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 1700 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Text] The Soviet Union is convinced that a treaty on the worldwide ban of chemical weapons can be concluded even before the production of such weapons by the United States. This was emphasized today by Kvitsinskiy, the USSR ambassador to Bonn, and by Israelyan, the permanent representative at the disarmament talks in Geneva. At a press conference held by the congress for a chemical weapon-free zone in Europe, organized by the Rhineland-Palatinate DGB, [German Trade Union Federation], Kvitsinskiy and Israelyan emphasized in Mainz the Soviet Union's willingness for on-site verification. Israelyan added that should the United States begin the production of new types of chemical weapons this would have a negative effect on the Geneva efforts.

British-Soviet Talks

LD190952 Moscow TASS in English 0908 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Text] London, June 19 TASS -- Soviet-British consultations on questions connected with the banning of chemical weapons were held here on June 18. The sides discussed a number of questions touched upon at the talks held within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

From the Soviet side the consultations were attended by the member of the Collegium of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Viktor Israelyan and from the British side -- by the Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Office Timothy Renton.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1440

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRIEFS

SECURITY COUNCIL DECISION--Bonn, 13 May (DPA)--In the future chemical weapons will not be deployed on German territory without the assent of the Federal Government, either in times of peace or of tension. A relevant agreement between Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl and U.S. President Ronald Reagan was taken note of, confirmed and made the basis of future NATO resolutions by the Federal Security Council in Bonn today, it was learned from informed quarters. The secret sessions of the Federal Security Council, which take place mainly in connection with cabinet sessions, are not officially confirmed. Government spokesman Friedheld Ost told journalists today merely that the council discussed issues relating to chemical weapons and established the Federal Government's position. [Excerpt] [Hamburg DPA in German 1413 GMT 13 May 86 LD] /12913

U.S. TO WITHDRAW CHEMICAL WEAPONS--[Trampe] Before the new binary chemical weapons are shipped to Europe, to the FRG, the FRG Government must be heard. Does that include a veto power, a right to object? [Woerner] Well, we have determined, together with the Americans, that new chemical weapons will only be allowed to enter our country with the FRG Government's approval. The old ones will be withdrawn, and they will be withdrawn from our territory by 1992 at the latest. This is the great success that Chancellor Kohl has had with President Reagan. [Interview with Defense Minister Manfred Woerner by correspondent Gustav Trampe in Brussels on 22 May, on the "Heute" news program--recorded] [Text] [Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1700 GMT 22 May 86 DW] /12913

FRG DENIES UPGRADING CHEMICAL WEAPONS--Bonn, 21 May (DPA)--The Foreign Ministry in Bonn has described the accusations made by the GDR about the planned modernization of Western stocks of chemical weapons as unfounded and groundless. A Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out when questioned that the United States has adhered to a moratorium on chemical weapons since 1969. The Warsaw Pact has not followed this example but has expanded its offensive capability in this sphere over the last few years. [Text] [Hamburg DPA in German 1638 GMT 21 May 86/ 8309

CSO: 5200/2698

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

BEIJING REVIEW: WARSAW PACT PROPOSAL TIMELY

Beijing BEIJING REVIEW in English No 25, 23 Jun 86 p 13

[Article by Xin Zong]

[Text]

Now that leaders of the seven-member Warsaw Pact closed their two-day summit in Budapest on June 11 with a major East-West troop reduction proposal, the United States and its NATO allies will have to sit down to scrutinize this arms reduction appeal before drafting their own version.

The Warsaw Pact proposal, which calls for an East-West troop reduction of 100,000 to 150,000 soldiers by each side over the next one or two years, a 25 percent cut in troop strength by the early 1990s, appears to be more dynamic than earlier proposals. It contains details of a general reduction call made by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on April 18 when he addressed the Socialist Unity Party Congress of Democratic Germany and suggested a definite timetable for the reductions.

The Warsaw Pact also broadened its former stand on disarmament by agreeing to verification measures for arms reduction, including on-site inspection of disarmament and troop reduction efforts.

The issue of verificaton has long been a sensitive point in the unproductive Vienna negotiations of the past 13 years.

Miklos Barity, deputy Hungarian foreign minister and secretary-general of the Pact, said at a press conference that the member states were prepared to introduce measures to monitor troop reductions through an "international consultative committee" with the participation of NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, interested neutral and nonaligned states, and other European countries.

Through NATO's eyes, however, the latest initiative — which to some extent reflects the wishes of Europeans who do not want to see an armed confrontation between the world's two biggest military blocs — would squeeze the US armed forces out of Europe while maintaining a strong Soviet military presence there.

It is evident that the proposed equal troop-cuts for both NATO and the Warsaw Pact would leave the Soviet Union with an advantage because the number of troops the Soviet Union now has stationed on the continent is much greater than that of the United States.

The United States has about 300,000 servicemen in Western Europe, but in Democratic Germany alone the Soviet Union has the same number of soldiers.

NATO may also consider it disappointing that the proposal fails to mention medium-range missiles positioned east of the Ural Mountains when it offered to withdraw the Soviet rockets installed in Democratic Germany and Czechoslovakia in exchange for the dismantling of US medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

Washington has repeatedly stated that any deal on missiles in Europe should take into account Soviet medium-range nuclear weapons based in Asia because these weapons may easily be moved into Europe in an emergency.

Despite all these differences, the proposal may signify a step towards agreement, particularly over issues such as verification.

According to reports from Brussels, a NATO spokesman said the Warsaw Pact proposals would be carefully considered. "It would be wrong to comment on the details before these ideas have been properly studied. But we certainly welcome all constructive contributions towards our objective," the spokesman said. It is significant that he refrained from calling it a propaganda ploy.

West European countries are expected to probe further what they may believe are constructive points in the Warsaw Pact proposal.

Whether it can break the decade-old deadlock in East-West disarmament talks remains to be seen.

One thing appears to be certain: The proposal will put more pressure on the Reagan administration for some positive move towards disarmament as major NATO members, Great Britain included, are opposed to the US decision to scrap the SALT II agreement.

/9317
CSO: 5200/4046

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: U.S. PLANS 25 JUNE NEVADA TEST

TASS Report

LD250658 Moscow TASS in English 0633 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS -- TASS News Analyst Vladimir Matyash writes:

The United States is planning to explode another nuclear device at a Nevada testing site today. A spokeman for the U.S. Department of Energy said that a device codenamed Darwin with a yield of up to 150 kilotons was going to be exploded underground. It will be the 13th nuclear weapon test announced by the United States since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions last August and the third one this year. In this way Washington, defying broad protests from the American and world public, stubbornly refuses to follow the Soviet example and halt nuclear explosions.

The Soviet Union, it should be remembered, stands for the immediate beginning of talks on a total nuclear test ban. Recently General Secretary Mikahil Gorbachev reiterated his proposal on an immediate meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan to reach accord on a nuclear test ban. The decision to extend the moratorium to August 6 was not easy to take for the Soviet Union: The Americans carried out 12 nuclear tests since the moratorium went into effect.

But this decision shows how great the Soviet Union's conviction is of the need to achieve an early nuclear test ban.

A joint meeting of the Foreign Affairs Commissions of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet the other day approved a resolution suggesting a working meeting of Soviet parliamentarians and U.S. congressmen in the near future. Since a nuclear outbreak would pose a mortal threat not only to the USSR and the USA but to all countries, the commission considers it very important for Soviet and American parliamentarians unambiguously to state their will to avert the danger looming over the world and to oblige their governments to pursue a vigorous policy of peace, disarmament and settlement of concentious issues through negotiations.

The USSR and the socialist community proceed from the assumption that a nuclear test ban is the command of the times. The socialist countries' position is supported by nonaligned and neutral states. The time has come to go from words to action, to preserve peace, to stop the arms race and to end nuclear testing.

'Staking on Sheer Force'

LD242257 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The United States has officially announced its plan to carry out a routine nuclear weapons test tommorrow at the test site in Nevada. Here is a commentary by our Political Observer Aleksandr Zholkver.

This new blast in Nevada, if it really does take place, will already be the 6th one this year and the 13 since the Soviet Union announced its moratorium on all nuclear blasts. These figures, which are ominous enough by themselves, graphically show the policy difference of the two powers. As was emphasized at the June CPSU Central Committee Plenum and at the session of the Supreme Soviet that has adopted our new 5-year plan, the Soviet Union calls for the strengthening of universal peace and for broad international cooperation; it suggests a concrete program for providing universal security, removing all kinds of weapons of mass destruciton and reducing conventional arms.

U.S. leaders, on the contrary, are staking on sheer force, on the nuclear fist, and on a terroristic piracy heavily infused with ideological intolerance. This gives rise to an essential difference in practical actions of both states, such as the prolongation of the moratorium on nuclear tests by the Soviet Union and more new nuclear blasts in Nevada. These Nevada blasts are dangerous not only because radiation leaks have occurred in the same Nevada site more than once, but also, to no lesser degree, because they are whipping up the arms race and are leading to the appearence of new kinds of weapons that are more and more devastating, both on earth and in space.

This time those in Washington are not concealing the new tests in Nevada are connected with the implementation of the star wars program. It is no mere coincidence that the Pentagon's boss took up arms against those congressmen who have dared to cut down on allocations for the notorious Strategic Defense Initiative. Meanwhile, the latest decisions by Congress, in particular its demand that the President observe the Soviet-American treaty on the restriction of strategic arms, are perceived by me as very symptomatic. They reflect the growth of concern over the adventurous Washington course not only in other countries but in the United States itself.

I recall that our country has recently taken new steps facilitating a search for mutually acceptable accords at the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva. If the United States ignores our initiatves once again and replies to them with new nuclear blasts, it will become obvious that the present Washington administration is conducting a mean game in a most serious issue on which the future of mankind depends.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1439

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA: U.S. BLOCKING CREATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIA NFZ

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Apr 86 p 5

[Article by Dmitriy Kosyrev: "A Pressing Idea"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] A. Peskov from Moscow asks about the declarations in the ASEAN countries in favor of creating a nuclear-free zone in South East Asia.

The proposal to declare Southeast Asia a zone free of nuclear weapons has already long attracted the attention of the peoples in states of the region. Back in 1968, Malaysia advanced the concept of creating a zone of peace there. In 1971 the concept received the support of all the ASEAN nations, which now includes Brunay, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines. Back then it was proposed that deploying foreign military bases in this zone should be prohibited and the production, delivery and testing of nuclear weapons banned.

Today only three nuclear-free zones have so far been created on the planet. One was declared in Latin America, in accordance with the (Tlatelolko) treaty, concluded in Mexico in 1967. Another is in Antarctica (Washington, 1959). The third is in the southern part of the Pacific Ocean (Avarua, 1985).

As far as Southeast Asia is concerned, in this region are found not only the ASEAN countries, but also Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. These three states also have advanced the concept of a peace zone and they also defend the idea of a nuclear-free zone. During the 1960's and 1970's the flames of Washington's aggressive war against the countries of Indochina burned, into which many states were drawn to one extent or another. Yes, today as well the situation there is far from quiet. Tension on the Kampuchea-Thailand border is not ebbing. Two major U. S. military bases in the Philippines are operating actively where, according to much evidence, nuclear weapons are stored. Yes, Southeast Asia, according to the widespread opinion of the peoples populating this region, needs guarantees of stable peace and good neighborliness. The creation of a nuclear-free zone there could be an important contribution to solving this problem. It is well known that the USSR also favors forming such zones, since it narrows the sphere of nuclear preparations. Recently this idea has begun to resound with new force in the ASEAN capitals. It was supported in September 1984 at the session of the

association standing committee in Kuala Lumpur. And in recent months it has been discussed actively in Indonesia and Malaysia. Recently David Lange, Prime Minister of New Zealand, visited Djakarta. According to press reports, he and his Indonesian hosts discussed in detail the status of the agreement signed in Avarua. The Indonesian side seemed to be fitting the agreement to Southeast Asia. After the visit of New Zealand's Premier, Djakarta declared its desire to conclude such a treaty in its own region as well.

However, thus far not all ASEAN states are speaking in support of the creation of a nuclear-free zone. As the Indonesian minister of foreign affairs acknowledged, a number of countries still need to be convinced of the need for such a step, "since they are linked by military commitments with major powers."

As for the "major powers," this refers in the first place to the U. S. And Washington's position on this question is utterly clear. Washington under no circumstances plans to remove its bases from the Philippines. Moreover, obvious attempts are being undertaken to restore the American military presence in Thailand. This week, for example, U. S. Secretary of Defense Weinberger arrived in Bangkok and held negotiations there about creating American strategic supply depots in that country in case of "emergencies."

For the peoples of the ASEAN countries the increased interest in the question of creating a nuclear-free zone in the region is no accident. The struggle against the nuclear threat is growing throughout the world, and last year a nuclear-free zone was created literally at the border of Indonesia, in the south of the Pacific Ocean. The desire to bar the path to nuclear weapons and secure a truly peaceful future for Southeast Asia is being felt there more and more strongly.

9069
CSO: 5200/1397

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: NORTH KOREA PROPOSES NUCLEAR-FREE PENINSULA

Government Statement Cited

PM241349 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Jun 86 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "DPRK Government Statement"]

[Text] Pyongyang, 23 Jun -- The DPRK Government has issued a statement in which it proposes that the Korean peninsula be transformed into a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace. The DPRK, the document notes, has acceded to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, is honestly fulfilling the obligations imposed by the treaty, and consistently favors the elimination of nuclear weapons from South Korea.

The United States has transformed the south of the Korean peninsula into one of its major nuclear bases in the Far East. Washington has openly declared its intention to use nuclear weapons here.

In the prevailing conditions, the DPRK deems it necessary to adopt urgent measures aimed aimed at averting nuclear war and ensuring lasting peace on the peninsula. The DPRK Government pledges that it will not test, produce, import, or site nuclear weapons on its territory or sanction the transportation of nuclear weapons through it. The United States must stop importing new types of nuclear weapons into South Korea, gradually withdraw all arms sited there, and renounce all plans to employ them in Korea. As for the DPRK, it is ready to enter into talks with the United States and South Korea on these questions.

The statement says that the DPRK Government and the Korean people will continue to do everything for the sake of peace in Korea, Asia, and throughout the world.

U.S. Response Viewed

LD242356 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Vladimir Korolev commentary]

[Text] In its circulated statement the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea proposes concrete measures to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone. The step is very timely. The United States, which has actually occupied South Korea, has turned it into a nuclear springboard. According to certain reports which Washington doesn't at all deny there are up to 1,000 nuclear charges at American bases

in the country at present and there are also delivery vehicles and they can at any moment be put into action. This, too, Washington doesn't attempt to conceal. Being aware of the danger that menaces not only Korea but also the neighboring peaceful countries, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has called on the United States not to introduce new types of nuclear weapons into South Korea but to withdraw, stage by stage, the nuclear weapons already deployed there. As for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, it pledges not to produce, use or permit the deployment of nuclear weapons on its territory and is ready to begin talks on the issue with Washington and Seoul.

The new peace initiatives of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea opens the way to easing tension on the Korean peninsula and eventually leads to implementing the cherished desire of all Koreans who want to see their country unified.

Every time when putting forth constructive proposals aimed at unifying Korea on a peaceful and democratic principle, Pyongyang underlines that the problem can be settled only if all American troops and their arms are withdrawn from the south of the country. However so far Washington and Seoul have responded to those moves by Pyongyang, which are in the interests of both the Korean and other peoples of the Far East by turning them down and by increasing military provocations on the Korean peninsula and nearby regions.

Such are the two policies in the Asian and Pacific area. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the other socialist countries seek to prevent a nuclear threat while the United States and its allies, on the contrary, are whipping up tension in that vast area of the world.

PRC In Favor

LD260713 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 25 Jun 86

[Text] China has backed a proposal by the Democratic People's Republics of Korea for making the Korean peninsula a nuclear free zone. A spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Ministry Ma Yu Chen said in Peking the peace initiative meets the interests of all Koreans seeking peace and less tension on the peninsula. China, he said, has always believed the United States must withdraw its troops and armanents, including nuclear weapons, from South Korea.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1439

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

SPD/SED TALKS--30 May (DPA)--The 2-day talks of a working group of SPD and SED on a nuclear weapons-free zone in central Europe ended on Friday in Bonn without noticeable progress. The two delegation leaders Bahr (SPD) and Axen (SED) spoke after the fourth round of negotiations of "intensive and businesslike talks." The talks are to be continued on 30 June in East Berlin. [Text] [Hamburg DPA in Germany 1105 GMT 30 May 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/2698

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA ON GORBACHEV GENEVA PROPOSALS, WARSAW PACT APPEAL

PM241207 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[Pavel Demchenko: "International Review"]

[Excerpt] The Main Aim

There are dates which people never forget. Time and oblivion have no power over them. One such day was 22 June 1941. The reader will remember: Exactly 45 years ago, as the shortest summer night was drawing to a close, war, a brutal and bloody war such as mankind had never known before, hit our country.

Before Soviet people won the great victory over Hitlerite fascism, which raised its sword against our motherland, they had to live through 1,418 days and nights of hell. And, subsequently, it still took just over 3 months to complete the rout of Japanese militarism and to draw the bottom line under the tragedy of World War II. The war claimed more than 50 million lives in many countries and turned cities, settlements, and villages into ruins...

The memory of these sacrifices and suffering is indelible. It compels us to ponder the lessons of history again and again and to contemplate the danger that is now intensifying over the planet, threatening the very existence of mankind. The harsh reality of our time demands that we seek the most effective means of averting catastrophe, returning the world to the times of detente, and firmly establishing the principles of broad cooperation between countries and people.

It is highly symbolic that only this week another appeal to the world rang out from Moscow: A specific and realistic program for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security was set forth. This took place at the CPSU Central Committee plenum. M.S. Gorbachev's report was devoted to both domestic and foreign policy problems and summed up the results of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee which was held in Budapest.

As the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee noted, all the comrades in Budapest agreed that the situation in the world remains complex and that there are as yet no grounds to speak of a relaxation of tension. The prospect of a relaxation of tension is viewed in the West, and above all by the reactionary U.S. ruling clique, as a threat to their interests. During the past few months and weeks we have witnessed a series of rejections of Soviet proposals pertaining to cardinal questions of present-day development -- the refusal to end nuclear explosions; the abandonment of existing accords on strategic weapons; and the refusal to keep space free from weapons.

The point is that the imperialist states' ruling circles regard the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union as a mighty obstacle to the implementation of their imperial plans aimed at achieving world supremacy and social revenge. Furthermore, they entertain the hope, albeit illusory, that they may be able to thwart the implementation of our creative plans, to hamper the development of the socialist countries, to throw us off the course mapped out by the 27th CPSU Congress, and to keep us in the fetters of the arms race.

Following these dangerous plans remains Soviet foreign policy's main aim. The socialist countries will never allow the United States to gain nuclear missile superiority. The fate of the world must not be left in imperialism's hands. That would mean only one thing -- sliding toward nuclear war.

In these complex conditions, the USSR and the fraternal countries are not allowing themselves to be dragged onto the path of deepening confrontation, and they consider it their duty to persistently continue their quest for opportunities to reduce arms and improve the international situation, in particular in Europe, which has already lived through the nightmare of two world wars and where major armies and arms, including nuclear arms, are now concentrated. Allow me to recall in this context that the highlight, so to speak, of the Budapest meeting was the proposal on the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces throughout Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

It is a question of a 25 percent reduction of both sides' armed forces within the next few years. This refutes the speculative argument that nuclear disarmament in Europe would supposedly leave the West European states at a disadvantage if the present level of conventional armed forces were to be maintained.

The CPSU Central Committee plenum adopted a resolution on the results of the Political Consultative Committee conference, which expresses the conviction that the "friendship and cohesion of the fraternal socialist countries and the further development of their collaboration with all peace-loving states and broad public forces will lead to the further buildup of socialism's peace offensive and the establishment of international cooperation with a view to achieving mutually acceptable accords in the sphere of arms limitation for the sake of the development and progress of all mankind."

What was the reaction abroad to the plenum materials? It is possible to say without exaggeration that it was tremendous. The decisions of our party's Central Committee do, of course, always attract much attention among politicians and the international public. After all, it is the ruling party of the world's first and most powerful socialist state whose policy has a tremendous impact on world developments. However, this time there is special interest both because this was the first Central Committee plenum after the 27th congress, which approved an innovative program for our society's accelerated development, and also because the international situation is so acute: People the world over are interested in Moscow's policy in the face of the provocative actions undertaken by Washington and its closest NATO allies.

The main view expressed by the foreign press is this: The Soviet Union is fully resolved to accelerate its progress along the path of socioeconomic development and is persistently translating its peace initiatives into reality.

After the plenum a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet was held which approved the State Plan for the country's economic and social development in 1986-1990; this session was followed by a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commissions. During this meeting alarm was expressed in connection with the U.S. Administration's decision to abandon observance of Soviet-American strategic arms limitation agreements, and Washington's claims that the Soviet Union does not comply with the obligations it has assumed were resolutely rejected. The adopted resolution proposes that a working meeting be held in the near future between members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and U.S. Congress foreign affairs bodies, and it expresses the hope that the U.S. Administration will reconsider all the consequences that its announced decision would entail and take steps which will help to stop mankind from sliding toward a nuclear catastrophe.

It goes without saying that, now as before, what is important is the U.S. side's answer. The next few says will tell what kind of an answer it is.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1445

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: U.S. ADMINISTRATION SHOULD HEED 'LESSONS' OF WAR

PM241623 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jun 86 Second Edition p 5

[Journalist's notes by A. Leontyev: "Remember in Order To Live"]

[Excerpts] They say that what is important is not what we experience but what we remember. The war left a considerable number of bitter and glorious dates in our memories. One of them is 22 June 1941.

We have not forgotten that tragic day -- the first day of the war that was forced on us, a day deafened by the savage whine of enemy planes, the explosion of bombs and shells, and the dying cries of women and children.

The tragedy of 1941 must not be repeated. The historical dispute between capitalism and socialism can and must be resolved by peaceful capitalism and socialism can and must be resolved by peaceful competition between the two systems, resolved by the peoples themselves. All disputes between states also can find their solution by political means alone. The time when rivals used clubs is past. Mankind has developed, matured, and grown sufficiently wise not to get into a fight, especially a nuclear one. President J. Kennedy spoke well when he said: "We have no need for a victory with radioactive ash in our mouths." If there were more than 50 million victims in World War II, the whole of mankind would perish in the event of a nuclear conflagration.

Past experience shows that gentlemen who have never smelled gunpowder are often particularly bellicose. It is simply amazing how easily the United States discusses a "first nuclear strike," "limited" and "unlimited" nuclear wars, and particle beam, laser, and chemical weapons, and how quickly it yields to anti-Soviet propaganda claiming that all Russians are bad and all Americans good.

People of my generation remember how the German "Fuehrer" began his "approach" to World War II with demands that the outcome of World War I be revised, with highflown speeches about "human rights" and "peoples oppressed by Bolshevism," and, of course, his "desire for peace." Is it possible that this coincidence embarrasses no one in Washington? No one wants to tar different people with the same brush, but nevertheless a certain similarity exists. And, it must be said, a dangerous similarity.

The American Administration does not wish to reckon with either the lessons of the war or the realities of the nuclear age. It is prepared to set the house on fire as long as it can fry itself an egg. The present master of the White House has called for a new "crusade" against the USSR, threatened to leave communism "on the rubbish heap of

After the plenum a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet was held which approved the State Plan for the country's economic and social development in 1986-1990; this session was followed by a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities Foreign Affairs Commissions. During this meeting alarm was expressed in connection with the U.S. Administration's decision to abandon observance of Soviet-American strategic arms limitation agreements, and Washington's claims that the Soviet Union does not comply with the obligations it has assumed were resolutely rejected. The adopted resolution proposes that a working meeting be held in the near future between members of the USSR Supreme Soviet and U.S. Congress foreign affairs bodies, and it expresses the hope that the U.S. Administration will reconsider all the consequences that its announced decision would entail and take steps which will help to stop mankind from sliding toward a nuclear catastrophe.

It goes without saying that, now as before, what is important is the U.S. side's answer. The next few says will tell what kind of an answer it is.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1445

history," and launched an unprecedented arms race and campaign of anti-Soviet lies and slander. The most recent months and weeks have seen a series of U.S. rejections of Soviet proposals on cardinal problems of world development: a refusal to stop nuclear tests; a rejection of existing arms accords; a refusal to leave space free of weapons. How can all this be explained?

The Soviet initiatives are regarded across the ocean as a powerful obstacle to the fulfillment of their imperial plans aimed at world domination and social revenge. As stressed at the CPSU Central Committee June plenum, our main foreign policy aim must be to foil these dangerous plans. Together with fraternal socialist countries we have proposed and will continue to propose every possible measure to preserve and strengthen peace. Millions of friends and all the world's peace-loving forces are on our side.

It is time to forget the past, our enemies say. For what reason? So that it will be easier to push mankind into the abyss of a new war -- that is what the United States and NATO believe. We have no need of war. Memory is our weapon in the struggle for a cloudless sky over the world. The weapon of millions of workers and of all reasonable, honest people. We must remember the past in order to preserve our planet. Remember in order to live.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1445

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET MILITARY PAPER ON U.S. SSBN, SURFACE NAVAL PROGRAMS

PM191330 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 86 Second Edition p 5

[G. Sturua article: "The Spearhead of Military Adventures; U.S. Navy -- Instrument of Aggressive Policy"]

[Text] The markings on the deck aircraft on the U.S. nuclear aircraft carrier Nimitz are the pirate emblem -- skull and crossbones. Crude force, overt brigandage, and misanthropy are advocated and preached in the United States increasingly blatantly. However, what is characteristic in this case that the pirate emblem used by the aircraft of one aircraft carrier could, with good reason, serve as the emblem of the entire U.S. Navy.

The Navy is traditionally used by Washington as the assault echelon in all kinds of military adventures and acts of state terrorism. Admiral Watkins, former chief of staff of the U.S. Navy, admitted that "between 1946 and 1982 on approximately 250 occasions when U.S. Armed Forces were used, the naval forces were the main factor in our response in approximately 80 percent of crisis situations." He added: "Although we are not in a war situation, the scale of our operations is approximately 20 percent higher than during the years of the Vietnam war."

In its pursuit of military superiority Washington is building up its naval forces on an unprecedented scale. Thus, according to the press, the Pentagon is planning to increase the size of the Navy from the present 540 combant units [boyevyye yedinitsy] to more than 600 by the end of the current decade. The number of aircraft carrier groups is to be increased from 13 to 15. The political blessing to this abrupt leap in the naval arms race was given at the highest level during the commissioning ceremony for the battleship New Jersey: "Superiority at sea," the head of the White House said, "is a must for us... We must be able to control air, surface, and submarine space so as to ensure our access to all the world's oceans."

However, the purely quantitative increase of the fleet of U.S. warships is only one side of the militarist coin. The other side being the qualitative changes in the nature of the tasks assigned to the U.S. Navy. According to a statement by the Pentagon chief, a paramount task of the Navy henceforth will be not only operations in sea lanes but also strikes against land targets.

For more than quarter of a century now the task of delivering strikes from the sea against the territory of the opponent was assigned to nuclear missile submarines (SSBN's). As is known, they are part of the strategic forces and come under a different "department," so to speak, as the marine component of the so-called strategic "triad." Equipped with long-range, high-precision missiles, the SSBN's have become a first-strike

weapon system. This system gets extensive coverage in the press. I would like to point out that the 1987 budget makes provision for the appropriation of means for the construction of an Ohio class submarine missile carrier, the 14th. The Pentagon is also expecting to obtain the means needed by the Navy to purchase Trident-2 missiles, with which missile submarines are to be equipped beginning in 1989. The Pentagon intends to build a total of 20 Ohio class SSBN's of which, according to the press, 7 are already in service.

Implementing the program for the so-called "nuclear rearmament" of America, the present U.S. Administration is equipping not only its strategic forces but also its general purpose forces including the Navy with new combat means at an accelerated rate.

Suffice it to say that in 1983 the Navy accounted for 2,765 (25.5 percent) of the 10,820 various nuclear munitions in the arsenal of the general purpose forces, according to foreign press reports. In the assessment of foreign military exports, around 250 warships of the general purpose forces are nuclear-equipped or nuclear-capable. They include 13 aircraft carriers, 3 battleships, 28 cruisers, around 70 destroyers, 60 frigates, and 75 multipurpose nuclear submarines. It is assumed that an aircraft carrier can carry up to 140 nuclear munitions, and a cruiser or destroyer up to 20.

Here it must be emphasized that among the various types of nuclear weapons with which the U.S. Navy is equipped, the Tomahawk nuclear cruise missiles are beginning to play an increasingly important role. As Admiral Hostettler, in charge of the program to equip the Navy with cruise missiles, has said, the Tomahawks represent an important nuclear weapon in the U.S. arsenal that adds new qualities to naval warfare. It is a question here of the Pentagon's endeavor to increase the potential of the general purpose forces by means of the cruise missiles, to turn these forces into a substantial reserve and, essentially, into a component of the strategic means. According to the foreign press, the U.S. Navy is planning to have around 4,000 cruise missiles by the beginning of the 1990's, including 758 nuclear-tipped cruise missiles. It is planned to increase the number of ships equipped with cruise missiles to 175-200 within the next few years.

Another type of mass destruction weapon the Pentagon is planning to use to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union at sea are chemical weapons. The well-known program for "chemical modernization" applies to all branches of the armed forces, including the Navy. And, as the Western press notes, it is especially ominous that the Pentagon seeks to equip not just warships but also transport ships with chemical weapons.

The tempestuous quantitative buildup of the fleet of warships and their equipment with mass destruction weapons is accompanied by a reinforcement of the offensive, aggressive postulates of the notorious U.S. "ocean strategy." The old thesis "he who rules the seas, rules the world" proclaimed back at the end of the last century by the ideologist of U.S. imperialism Admiral Mahan is given concrete expression in the aggressive foreign policy course of contemporary America. Thus, the aforementioned Admiral Watkins in a report on U.S. naval strategy importunely calls for containement "at the brink of war." It abounds in expressions such as "show of strength," "embark on destruction," "engage in neutralization."

The latest piratical actions of the U.S. armada, including three aircraft carriers, near the Libyan coast show that these words are not just rhetoric. Every unprejudiced person regards Washington's blatantly piratical actions with respect to Libya as the concrete implementation of the doctrine of "neoglobalism" which envisages U.S. interference in the

affairs of sovereign states and the kindling of tension in various parts of the world. The most dangerous instrument of this interference are the U.S. Armed Forces and in particular the Navy, which operates as the spearhead in military adventures and has earned for itself the infamous nickname imperialism's "floating gendarme."

A most important contribution to the improvement of the international atmosphere could be made by ending the arms race on the seas and in the oceans, by limiting naval activity. The USSR has repeatedly expressed its readiness to reach an agreement with the United States on the mutual limitation of naval operations and the extension of confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans. The blame for the fact that these questions have so far not been properly resolved falls squarely on the United States.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1445

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW COMMENTARY ON DIFFERENT DISARMAMENT APPROACHES

OW232247 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 17 Jun 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Aleksandr Serikov commentary: "Two Approaches to Problems of Peace and Disarmament"]

[Text] Hello, comrades. As Comrade Gorbachev emphasized in his report at the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum, frustrating the aggressive designs of the ruling imperialist circles must be the main goal of our foreign policy. The peaceful steps that have been undertaken by our country are known. These include the plan for eliminating nuclear weapons by the year 2000, our moratorium on nuclear explosions, and the proposal on the destruction of chemical weapons. All these and other Soviet initiatives are aimed at improving the world climate.

However, the prospects for relaxing tensions in international affairs are being perceived in the West, first of all by the U.S. reactionary ruling clique, as a threat to the realization of their imperialist designs of universal supremacy.

This is exactly what has caused the series of rejections to the Soviet proposals on the principal problems of contemoporary development: the refusal to end nuclear experiments, the rejection of existing agreements on strategic weapons, and the refusal to leave outer space free of weapons. As the report noted, the U.S. leaders continue to assess the contemporary international situation using star wars, nuclear warheads, the arms race, and militarist blackmail as a yardstick, thereby increasingly undermining the security of the whole world as well as that of their own country.

Everything demonstrates that the world situation remains complex, and there are, so far, no grounds for talking about the relaxation of tensions. Such is the conclusion reached by the participants of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact member-states.

The confident voice of Moscow has again sounded on this uneasy, troubled situation. The USSR, declared Comrade Gorbachev at the CPSU Central Committee plenum, will persistently continue to carry out its initiatives, which answer the innermost hopes of our people and all people on the planet. Our country will not permit an intensification of the military-political confrontation to be forced on mankind, which would mean a slide to nuclear war. We shall never permit U.S. nuclear missile superiority, was the plenum's message. In this, our Leninist foreign policy course and our defensive might are supported by the reliable basis of the acceleration of social and economic development that the party has worked out.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1445

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW, CHINA VOW NO-FIRST-USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

OW150304 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Leonidov commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners: 15 June is the fourth anniversary of the Soviet declaration not to use nuclear weapons first. Of the five nuclear powers, only two -- the Soviet Union and China -- have undertaken this obligation. The United States and two other Western nuclear powers have obstinately refused to follow the example of our two socialist countries. Please listen to the following commentary by our station observer Leonidov:

The nuclear threat is a grim reality of our times. The United States is the country to develop and use nuclear weapons, as well as the leader in the nuclear arms race. Therefore, it is the chief culprit of the danger of the threat of a nuclear holocaust. I would also like to remind you that the United States is the only nuclear power that possesses a nuclear arsenal outside its territory -- in Western Europe, the Far East, and the Indian Ocean region. Major socialist centers in Europe and Asia and developing countries on all continents are perpetually the target for the U.S. nuclear guided missiles.

The fact that the U.S. ruling clique has refused to undertake the obligation not to use nuclear weapons first has aroused the deep concern of people all over the world. They urge the Washington authorities to follow the noble example of the Soviet Union and China in formally acknowledging the principle not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

As is universally known, the principal demand of the worldwide antinuclear movement is to stop nuclear tests. As early as last year, the 40th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombing of Japan's Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Soviet Union unilaterally declared its readiness to stop all nuclear tests and proposed that a treaty on ending nuclear tests be signed between the United States and the Soviet Union. So far, the Soviet Union has postponed the period for its unilateral end to nuclear tests three times and has not carried out any test in the past 9 months.

People all over the world have responded positively to the Soviet proposal for ending nuclear tests, first bilaterally, and then multilaterally by all nuclear powers. However, the U.S aggressive clique has never retreated from its policy of manufacturing more advanced nuclear weapons and expanding its nuclear arsenal. In the 9 months since the Soviet Union unilaterally stopped nuclear tests, the United States has carried out 12 nuclear tests in Nevada, including 5 this year. Furthermore, as you know, these

tests were directly related to the U.S. plan to develop offensive space weapons. The Soviet Union, China, and many other countries have demanded that under no circumstances should space militarization be allowed to become a reality. However, the U.S. ruling clique has turned a deaf ear to these rational views.

Dear listeners, according to reports, Hu Yaobang, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, reiterated at a London press conference that China favors a universal ban and the complete destruction of nuclear and chemical weapons, and opposes the militarization of space. It is very important that our two socialist countries share identical views on these major issues of our times. This has provided broad possibilities for concerted action by the Soviet Union and China in the struggle to eliminate the nuclear threat and ensure lasting and stable peace in Asia and the world as a whole.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1445

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: CARRINGTON PRESSURES NORWAY ON SDI, ARMS SPENDING, NFZ

LD241359 Moscow TASS in English 1332 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Oslo, 24 Jun (TASS)--Lord Carrington, the NATO secretary-general, arrived here for a four-day unofficial visit.

Local observers are of the opinion that during his talks with Johan Holst, minister of defense of Norway, Knut Frydelund, minister of foreign affairs of Norway, and other officials' Lord Carrington will press for a change in the stand of the Norwegian Government which refused to support unconditionally President Reagan's "star wars" plans at the session of the NATO Military Planning Committee held last May at the level of defense ministers.

The headquarters of the North Atlantic alliance is annoyed at Oslo's reluctance to increase its military budget by 7 percent a year, as required by the directives of the NATO command. It is also displeased with the basic principles of Norway's foreign policy which does not allow the construction of foreign military bases and the deployment of nuclear weapons on the country's territory in peacetime.

It follows from Lord Carrington's statement made to a group of Norwegian journalists on the eve of his departure for Oslo that the NATO leadership was seriously concerned over what he called a certain shift of priorities in Norway's foreign policy after the Norwegian Labor Party had come to power in the country last May.

The NATO secretary-general did not bother to conceal that he was going to bring pressure to bear on the government which did not want to follow blindly the instructions given to it by the North Atlantic alliance.

We should do everything possible to ensure full backing of different proposals by the NATO countries, Lord Carrington said.

The NATO secretary-general reiterated his negative stand on the idea of establishing a nuclear-free zone in Nordic Europe. In his words, the idea of nuclear free-zone is at variance with NATO's general strategy.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1445

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET SCIENTISTS ON NUCLEAR WAR EFFECTS ON BIOSPHERE

Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 86 p 3

[Article by Vladimir Lvov: "The Fate of the Human Race." For the Full Text of Goldanskiy's Article, see the USSR REPORT: TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No 1, January 1986, JPRS-UKO-86-008, 21 Apr 86, pp 107-118]

[Text] When the leaders of Argentina, India, Mexico, Sweden, Tanzania and Greece appealed recently to the leaders of the two great nuclear powers, an unconcealed alarm could be heard in this appeal. "We are all living," they wrote, "confronted by the most terrible possibility of our destruction in a nuclear conflagration." We all, it stated further, appeal to you "to do everything possible to avert this threat..."

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev answered this appeal with portentous words. Yes, "today the fate of the human race itself has been placed in question." And the next day in answer to French professor (Marois) he repeated this thought still more clearly and sharply: "If we step over this line (in the arms race), life on earth will hang by a thread, which may be broken at any instant..."

It is known how this unprecedented situation in human history arose.

It was created by the arms race unleashed by imperialism and the stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction. Research by Soviet and American scholars has shown with mind chilling clarity where a massive exchange of missiles would lead. "Nuclear winter" was what the abyss was named into which the mad militarists are prepared to push mankind. "Nuclear winter" means the smoke from enumerable fires and the black dust which will blanket the earth's atmosphere for long weeks and months. Haze and cold will reign from the equator to the poles over the whole planet. The stream of solar rays will decline to a level fatal to vegetation. Animals and people will be left without food. Hunger and illnesses will cut down those who did not perish in the first minutes.

Is this not enough? But no, as if jeering at the human race, those who contemplate nuclear slaughter add to this terrible picture the satanic "Star Wars" program. If they are successful in implementing it, it will threaten to turn not only the earth's air and water, but even near-earth space into hell!

Recently the theoretician of nuclear plunder, the not unknown Edward Teller, shared with his listeners in one of the subcommittees of the American Congress this comforting thought. The sense of it boils down to the view that even if life disappears from the face of the earth for some period of time, it will be "nothing terrible." Some seeds and embryos will remain, he says. Some human specimens (Teller, apparently, has in mind himself and people from his high station) will stay for a time in super-deep bunkers and mines. There they will look around, everything will settle down, the sun will be seen again, everything will start to turn green, and it will be possible to begin the tale anew!

You are mistaken, Mr. Teller. Most unfortunately, you are mistaken. Nothing will turn green any longer, and you will have to spend out the rest of your days in your bunker.

In front of me are recent 1985 issues of "Reports of the USSR Academy of Sciences," issued periodically, which publish the most important works of Soviet physicists, biologists and specialists in other natural sciences. And so important is the research about which we are speaking that its results were published by KOMMUNIST, the theoretical and political journal of the Central Committee of our Party, in an article by academician V. I. Goldanskiy in this year's first edition.

This is how academician Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy formulates the final conclusion of his research:

"The super-powerful additional racemic effects of weapons of mass destruction may represent a special danger...IT WOULD MEAN THE COMPLETE, DEFINITIVE DISAPPEARANCE OF THE BIOSPHERE. THE LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT OF THE PLANET WOULD BE THROWN BACK BILLIONS OF YEARS!"

Racemic effects?

The term is not used in everyday life. The term is understood only by a narrow circle of specialists. But a leading Soviet scientist explained precisely this term, loudly and within earshot of all, in connection with the most burning question of our time. It is precisely with this term that the new and ominous threat has been linked which has now been added to the terrible threat hanging over life on the planet.

People of good will in all countries, who look with alarm at the machinations of the nuclear maniacs, must think about this term.

We must decipher it.

The research undertaken by a group of scientists headed by academician Goldanskiy began with a circle of questions seemingly far from the problems troubling mankind.

We will be talking about one the peculiarities of certain complex chemical compounds. All of them consist, as is known, of particles (molecules),

identical for every substance. But there are cases when among the molecules of one and the same substance examples occur which are slightly different in the "sketch" of their structure. Specifically, one type of molecule differs in these cases from another in the way an article differs from its reflection in a mirror, or a left handed glove differs from a right-handed glove.

Figuratively speaking, the structure of some molecules is distorted from right to left, and that of others from left to right. At first glance the difference is not great, but the consequences may be immeasurably great.

These and other molecules (we call them "left" and "right" molecules) are most often intermingled in equal numbers. And their mixture chemists call racemic.

We have met here, consequently, the same term which sounded so alarming several lines above. Let us see where this threat leads us.

All living organisms, as biochemists long ago explained, are structured from substances with molecules of only one "mirror" form. This is related most of all to the main chemical foundation of life -- proteins and nucleic acids (the celebrated DNA and RNA). This circumstance is decisive for life on the planet! For it is only from elements of identical "left" form that long chains characteristic of earth's protein molecules can be constructed. And in exactly the same way, only the identical "leftness" of elements of DNA molecules can provide for forming this molecule with its twisted, spiral features.

How did it happen, one might ask, that out of the disorderly mixture of "right" and "left" molecules in the lifeless natural environment, organisms could arise at all with absolutely identical molecular "mirror-surfaces?" What force billions of years ago sorted out some molecules from others and opened to way for living molecules?

This is the central mystery of the origin of life; the mystery which many generations of scientists struggled with for long years. The stake in terms of world outlook placed on its solution is too high. It is well known that any major hitch in scientific inquiry is always an occasion for speculations by reactionary ideologues. If no material cause for the phenomena is found, God is immediately presented as the reason.

Today with pride in Soviet materialist science we can say that the "central riddle" about which we are speaking is close to a solution. Theoretical research by the brilliant young scientist, L. L. Morozov, who died an untimely death in 1984, played a key role here. But now, in order not to be sidetracked, I will not discuss this topic and hope to return to it another time.

Now another aspect of the problem is of interest to us.

Normally people are surrounded by a biosphere; i.e., by plants and animals consisting from time immemorial of ideally pure substances (in the sense of the absence of racemic mixtures). We use them for food and the entire life cycle on the planet is based on this purity.

And life on earth will not survive if organic substances comprised of a racemic mixture of molecules mix with our food, water and air. That is, if molecules whose structure is not that required by living cells and tissues begin to invade organisms. The insidiousness of this trap is that by outward appearance and many features racemic products may not differ from "mirror" pure products. Both molecules seem identical. But the difference in the change in their structure will immediately have its effect. Molecules with an inappropriate "mirror-structure" will not be assimilated by the organisms. It is just as impossible as it is to try to screw a right-threaded screw into a left-threaded hole. Racemic food will not be of benefit. And, more than this, the presence of molecules of inappropriate orientation may have catastrophic consequences.

The tragic episode of thalidomide showed this. Nervous system calming tablets were manufactured in Western Europe under this name. No attention was paid to the fact that the medication was racemic; i.e., it contained equal numbers of "left" and "right" molecular structures. The result was tragic. The children of women who took thalidomide during pregnancy were born with physical deformities. Later it became clear that only one of the two types of molecule antipodes was responsible for the catastrophy.

But the thalidomide case is only a weak hint of what total militaristic mindlessness will bring mankind.

The gigantic whirlwind brought down upon the planet by the explosion of tens of megatons of nuclear explosives may have consequences extending not for months and years, but for hundreds of millions and billions of years. In this hellish whirlwind, academician Goldanskiy warns, "the total racemization of the environment may take place."

"In assessing the possibility of such a super-catastrophy," continues the author of the KOMMUNIST article, "it is necessary to understand clearly that we are not talking so much about simultaneous, super-powerful racemicizing effects, as we are about the consequences of protracted action. Such a super-catastrophy may be characterized without exaggeration as complete collapse (destruction to nothingness -- V. L.) of life..."

Under these conditions, in order for life again to appear on earth, Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy writes, "it would be necessary to again pass through all the stages of pre-biological evolution of matter."

That is, an earth without life for hundreds of millions and billions of years. The speech by Comrade Gorbachev on 29 March over Soviet television again concentrated the attention of the whole world on the question of questions: How can we stop the arms race now, immediately? How can we bar the path to the mindless slide to the abyss which threatens to turn the planet earth into a lifeless desert of death?

Such a barrier today can come through halting all nuclear explosions.

When for our side it was declared that the Soviet Union would not conduct nuclear tests after 31 March until the first U. S. nuclear explosion, the world held its breath. The world awaited an answer from the other side to this noble, selfless act. It was selfless because by going almost eight months without nuclear testing, the Soviet Union bore definite and significant costs for the sake of peace on earth.

The world awaited an answer.

And an answer came. Impudently and crudely flouting the hopes of mankind, and throwing a challenge to the peoples, the militaristic mafia at the end of March exploded a 150 kiloton bomb on a range in Nevada and announced a new explosion to be carried out in April.

They answered.

The last word in this question of life and death for mankind, however, has not by any means been said. The last word will belong to the peoples of peace. As Comrade M. S. Gorbachev stated in his television address, "it is necessary to act together. This concerns each and every person."

Each and every one.

9069
CSO: 5200/1397

END

JPRS-TAC-86-055

15 JULY 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-055

15 JULY 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG Press Reviews Foreign Minister's Geneva Speech
(Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 11 Jun 86) 1

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS: Arms Negotiator Rowny Justifies U.S. SALT Violation
(Moscow TASS, 10 Jun 86) 2

USSR: Claims of Soviet SALT II Violations Rebutted
(Moscow in English to North America, 15 Jun 86) 3

IZVESTIYA Likens Perle SALT Comment to Joseph McCarthy
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 14 Jun 86) 9

FRG Papers Comment on Reagan SALT II Declaration
(Various sources, various dates) 11

Press Review 11
Newspaper Editorial 12
Papers View Bundestag Debate, SALT 12
Genscher on European, U.S. Views 13
Press Analyzes Reagan's Statements 14

Karpov Comments on Reagan SALT II Decision's Impact
(Hamburg ARD Television Network, 13 Jun 86) 16

USSR's Falin on SALT II Decision's Impact on Summit
(Valentin Falin; Vienna VOLKSSTIMME, 14 Jun 86) 17

Further Soviet Commentaries Assailing Reagan SALT II Decision
(Various sources, various dates) 19

Contradicts 1985 Summit, by Spartak Beglov 19
'Worst Conclusions' Confirmed, by Vladimir Bogachev 21
U.S. Seeks 'Superiority', by Aleksandr Druzhinin 22
Numerical Ceilings Discussed, by Leonid Ponomarev 22
'Blatant' U.S. SALT, ABM Violations, by I. Nikolayev 23
'Dangers' Listed 26
SALT II Not Obsolete, by G. Dadyants 27
U.S. 'Crushing' Treaties 30

PRC People's Daily Views 'Storm' Over SALT Issues
(Zhang Liang; Beijing RENMIN RIBAO, 14 Jun 86) 32

Briefs
TASS on Minuteman-3 Test 34

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

FRG CDU/CSU 'Disappointed' With Pact Proposals
(Hamburg DPA, 11, 12 Jun 86; Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 12 Jun 86) 35

Todenhoefer Expresses 'Disappointment' 35
Genscher's Remarks 35
Vogel Welcomes Proposals 36
Press on Disarmament Proposals 37

RELATED ISSUES

USSR's Bovin: U.S. Actions Intended 'To Block Summit Meeting'
(A. Bovin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 24 Jun 86) 38

Moscow Views Shifting U.S. Response to Soviet Initiatives
(Aleksandr Zholkver; Moscow Domestic Service, 19 Jun 86) . 40

TASS: U.S. Considers 'Insertable Nuclear Components'
(Moscow TASS, 16 Jun 86) 41

TASS Reports on Pugwash Geneva Meeting
(Moscow TASS, 14, 17 Jun 86) 42

Meeting Opens 42
Urges Observance of SALT II 42
Karpov Meets Leaders 43

TASS: World Peace Council on UN Disarmament-Development Forum
(Moscow TASS, 9 Jun 86) 44

Moscow Religious Round Table on Arms Race, Poverty
(V. Kondrashov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 26 May 86) 45

TASS Reports on Socialist International Congress in Lima
(Moscow TASS International Service, 22 Jun 86; Moscow TASS, 23, 24 Jun 86) 47

CPSU Greetings 47
Speakers Criticize Arms Race 50
Congress Manifesto 51

USSR: Physicians Against Nuclear War Hold Hiroshima Symposium
(Various sources, various dates) 52

Worldwide Appeal, by Vykhukhalev 52
Tokyo Press Conference 53
Statement by Lown, Chazov 54

Karpov Said To Head New USSR Foreign Ministry Arms Section
(Paris AFP, 17 Jun 86) 55

CSSR Academician Addresses Moscow Forum on Peace, Environment
(Prague CTK, 28 May 86) 56

USSR's Petrovskiy on Foreign Ministry Reshuffle, Arms Issues
(V. F. Petrovskiy Interview; Rome LA REPUBBLICA, 17 Jun 86) 57

/9987

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

FRG PRESS REVIEWS FOREIGN MINISTER'S GENEVA SPEECH

DW110925 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 11 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Text] One of today's editorial topics is the UN disarmament conference in Geneva.

The Ulm *SUEDWEST-PRESSE* writes: Foreign Minister Genscher was right in making the demand for worldwide abolishment of chemical weapons the main point of his speech. After all, the FRG is the only European country in the Western alliance where such weapons are stored as a counterbalance to the Soviet chemical weapons potential. That sinister potential understandably creates fear — especially after Chernobyl. It gives the Bonn opposition an opportunity to score points against the Federal Government with the demand for a chemical weapons-free zone in Europe. It is in the interest of the FRG to press the United States and the USSR to achieve an egreement on the destruction of chemical weapons.

MANNHEIMER MORGEN maintains: The foreign minister's appeal is remarkable because it is directed mainly at the leading power of our own alliance, whose activities in the security field are causing increasing concern for the European partners. However, experience shows that Washington will not be particularly impressed by it. After all, the Geneva conference is the right forum for doing the necessary preparatory work for a worldwide ban on chemical weapons. As soon as a proposal is submitted, we will see how serious the superpowers are about their declared intentions.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU notes: Foreign Minister Genscher has outlined a concrete and clear route in Geneva. He considers time to be more than ripe eventually to achieve worldwide destruction of the chemical weapons potential. He is right in objecting to a more modest solution, the chemical weapons-free zones the SPD has in mind, because it would create more insecurity in areas that are not involved. It is remarkable that Genscher is steering such a clear course. However, in doing it he is contradicting Bonn's official attitude and the recent agreement on U.S. production of new binary weapons. However, that should not take anything away from Genscher's meritorious continuation of his policy on arms control.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2706

SALT/START ISSUES

TASS: ARMS NEGOTIATOR ROWNY JUSTIFIES U.S. SALT VIOLATION

LD102236 Moscow TASS in English 2149 GMT 10 Jun 86

[Text] London, 10 Jun (TASS)--TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov reports:

The SALT II Treaty "has outlived its usefulness" to Washington, and the U.S. stands to gain from the violation of its provisions, said Edward L. Rowny, special adviser to the U.S. President and secretary of state on arms control. He made this statement to a correspondent of the JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY.

Lifting the restrictions under the SALT II treaty would allow the U.S. to continue "modernizing" its strategic nuclear forces, the special adviser to the President said.

The point at issue, in real fact, is the U.S. plan for a further deployment of intercontinental ballistic missile "MX", creation of the mobile missile Midgetman, new cruise missiles to be carried in bomber aircraft.

The special adviser to the President was trying to justify the militaristic plans of the U.S. by totally groundless claims about "violations" of the SALT II Treaty by the Soviet Union. One of his arguments was that the USSR has created SS-25 ICBM (as the Soviet missile RS-12M is called in the West), but it is, in real fact, a modernized version of the missile "RS-12", which is permitted under the SALT II Treaty.

Commenting on the statement by Edward Rowny, the JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY pointed out that the NATO allies of the U.S. had expressed their protest at the latter's intention to end its compliance with the SALT II Treaty. Edward Rowny admitted that there were such sentiments among the West Europeans, but made it clear that the U.S. did not wish to reckon with them.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: CLAIMS OF SOVIET SALT II VIOLATIONS REBUTTED

LD162229 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Jun 86

["Top Priority" discussion program hosted by Pavel Kuznetsov with Prof Radomir Bogdanov and Prof Sergey Plekhanov of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute for United States of America and Canada Studies].

[Text] Hello, I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on today's edition of "Top Priority," a weekly panel discussion of major world events from the North American service of Radio Moscow. Together with me in the studio are Professor Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the Moscow based Institute for USA and Canada Studies. The topic for today's discussion is the decision by the American Administration to abandon the SALT II treaty later this year. The decision has cast a very dark cloud in my view over the arms control process, U.S.-Soviet relations, including the issue of a new Soviet-American summit and, as some Western observers believe, has thrown U.S.-West European relations into a disarray. The President's decision, described as a big victory for hawks and right-wing circles is explained as being inevitable in view of persistent Soviet noncompliance. Without assuming the role of a devil's advocate I'd like you to take a look at some of the American charges. Dr Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] You know, first of all I would like to add to what you have said just now and to make it more serious than you did in the sense that to my mind this Administration tries to begin a new era, a Reagan era, or whatever you call it. They have destroyed the last remnants of the network, if you like, of the Soviet-American relations based on the treaty, SALT treaty, and I'm afraid that the second target or the third, if you like, the third target is ABM Treaty [of] 72. That's the preparation for that. I have been a student of that kind of set of accusations of the Soviet Union for so many years now, the so-called Soviet violations. Now they have summed it up in a very short form, you know, saying that the Soviet Union has been violating the SALT II treaty in three basic provisions. Number one: They have created, I mean the Soviet side, they, in violation of the treaty, they have created a new type of Soviet missile which is called SS by their terminology, SS-25, and by our terminology RC-12M.

The second accusation is that in violation of the provisions of the treaty we are over, (?over-recording), the telemetric information emitted during the tests by our new missiles, that the American side cannot, are not able to, pick up the real weight, whole weight, you know, the booster, and things like that.

And the third violation is very closely linked with ABM Treaty [of] 72, that's, near Krasnoyarsk we built a station which is, with phased, you know.

[Kuznetsov] Phased array.

[Bogdanov] Phased array, which is very clear indication that we are finishing the ABM defense. Three accusations. Now there is a fourth one which is debated in different American circles. Did the Soviet Union violate the level of SALT treaty?

[Kuznetsov] The total number of delivery vehicles?

[Bogdanov] The total of delivery vehicles, or not [word indistinct]. Let me start with the Krasnoyarsk station. It's still under construction it is still not finished, and we have informed the American side; we have told many times at the standing committee in Geneva, that gentlemen, please, for heavens sake, wait until we've finished that station, then by emission of the waves you will measure very easily; you will see very easily that it has nothing to do with ABM defense; it has to do with space, Soviet and American detections of objects in the space. Okay, I understand American worries, I understand American suspicions, that's why we have suggested to the American side a very businesslike approach: if you're so much for it, let's do it like that. You've built, building up, you Americans, two stations, but we believe really (?ABM) stations in Greenland and in England. If you are so much worried about ours we are ready to stop it immediately, the construction of that station -- but you stop yours.

[Kuznetsov] Actually, they are finishing one of them. I believe the other is in the planning stage, so it's not a total (?loss).

[Bogdanov] Yeah, yeah, but I mean, you know, if you are so much worried about it, you say that's the violation and you are not ready to wait until you've seen it in construction, that's our suggestion to you. Please, let's change, you know, one under construction for yours in Greenland. Isn't it a fair deal? I believe it's a fair deal. But if, of course, you have goodwill you know, if you are really inclined to tackle that problem.

[Kuznetsov] What can you say about the other two accusations against our country?

[Plekhanov] Well, the accusation about the two allegedly new missiles which are supposed to be a violation of the SALT II treaty, I can say that actually one missile is allowed, creation of one new missile is allowed by the SALT II treaty and there is such a missile in the Soviet Union, it's called RS-22, or SS-23 as it is known in the American parlance, or as NATO calls it. As for the second one, which Americans mention, SS-25, it's not a new one, it's a modernization of an old missile and such modernization is clearly within the limits allowed by the SALT II treaty. The reason why they bring up this ghost of the second new missile is because they are in the process of creating the second missile, "idgetman. They've already made a decision that they're going to create a Midgetman missile and in order to provide room for that they need that myth of the Soviet violations.

[Kuznetsov] There is something else they say. They say that modernization is when a new missile differs in payload from the old one, the one that's being modernized, by 5 percent and they claim that this SS-25 is different from the old one by 92 percent.

[Bogdanov] You know what's the trick? The trick is very simple and they never tell the public opinion about that. When we were testing the missile which was called SS-(?13) they never added to the weight of the missile the special, you know, testing devices.

[Kuznetsov] All kinds of measuring instruments...

[Bogdanov] All kinds of measurement instruments and things like that, quite heavy. Now in this case, in the case of SS-25, all of a sudden they're adding to the weight, to the weight of the missile all the measurement instruments which are beyond maybe 100, 200, 300 kg, you know. And when we tell them, and we've been explaining to them many times, in Geneva, through other channels (?at least) gentlemen, let us stop the testing, we will dismantle, we will remove that measurement instrument then you will see that SS-20 -- what you call SS-25 -- it's not beyond 5 percent allowed by the treaty. They say no.

[Kuznetsov] As far as the encryption goes, or the coding of telemetric signals during flight tests of missiles, I've come across a very curious observation by an American expert who said that when the Soviet Union asks the Americans what they need that's being denied to them in terms of this telemetric data they refuse to be specific.

[Plekhanov] Telemetry encryption is allowed by the SALT II treaty, and the United States does it too, but the problem is that the encryption does not involve those particular -- does not create problems for verifying the compliance to the SALT II treaty. That means certain data must not be encrypted. Well, the Soviet Union has been scrupulously observing those positions of the treaty. Since the United States has raised the point we offered serious businesslike discussions. Let's agree on what particular parameters worry you. Let's agree on a certain set of data which should not be encrypted and then help maintain the compliance. They refuse to do that, they refuse to do that because the simple fact is that they do not want this treaty. They wanted to see it destroyed.

[Kuznetsov] The situation with regard to SALT II is presented as a case of Soviet violations versus very strict compliance by the United States. How true is this? My question to you, Radomir.

[Bogdanov] Well, you know, as to the American compliance, you know as to the SALT II treaty they have begun to destroy that treaty, violate that treaty years ago. And we have put our grievances on the table several times at the standing committee in Geneva. And the most general gross violation of the teaty was deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, that's gross violation. Then you have the same problem with the encryption, you have the same problem with the ABM Treaty, you have other problems with the cruise missiles, and so on and so on. Now you may put the question: Why, if you have so many American violations, why have you kept silent? No we never kept silent. We just never made it public, in a way, to not jeopardize the process of arms control. We always were talking about that at the special standing committee in Geneva meant for that.

[Kuznetsov] The standing Consultative Committee...

[Bogdanov] Consultative Committee to -- yeah -- you know. We were trying always to keep it within the limits of that committee because we were -- and I think we are quite right -- we were taking into consideration the fact that uninformed public opinion might be very easily misled, make very strong conclusions, because it's a very complex matter and so we are trying to exchange our, you know, grievances with the Americans, with the American experts around the table. And mind you, Pavel, if you asked them, the American experts sitting over there, and their leaders of the American delegations, I wouldn't like to mention their names, but you may come across a number of public statements asserting that the Soviet Union is strictly complying with the treaty and now they have the nerve to suggest that we were violating and whatever [words indistinct] their exploitation. But now it goes out like, you know, like something very sensational, you know: Ha, those Russians.

[Kuznetsov] This being the situation, why do you think the American officials keep insisting on a new Soviet-American summit? What do they expect to achieve?

[Plekhanov] I think that one reason why they are insisting on a summit, or making statements in favor a summit is that they're worried about the impact of their actions on the world public opinion and the American public opinion. You know, Geneva created new hopes. In Geneva there was a possibility of a relaxation of tensions, of some progress in arms control. But in the months since Geneva the U.S. Government has done so much damage to the arms control talks, to the whole international atmosphere. Because of a number of things that they've done, the atmosphere has worsened in Soviet-American relations. Those relations are now at a worse stage than they were a year ago.

[Bagdanov] And if you take into consideration all that you have said just now, we come to the conclusion that the American side is trying to use the summit meeting as a kind of a cover for the arms control...

[Kuznetsov] Do you suggest that they would like to talk for the sake of talking, without doing anything?

[Bagdanov] That's my suspicion, Pavel, to be frank with you. By one hand they are destroying everything in the arms control, they are killing the last remnants of the arms control, by the other hand they're creating an impression that they are dying for a summit which may, you know, bring improvement, something like that.

[Kuzentsov] What is the Soviet position with regard to a summit?

[Bogdanov] The Soviet position, you know, it is very simple: We have no conditions. We are ready to go. By the way, we have suggested twice to the American President to meet at any place in Europe to discuss a moratorium, stopping all tests immediately, anytime, any place. Now, but at the same time you know, to come over here just for the sake of shaking hands, or another smile. It's too expensive you know, and it's senseless.

[Plekhanov] And politically misleading.

[Bogdanov] And politically misleading, because as I told you already, and you may agree with me, that to use a summit, such an important thing, as a cover for a new arms race is absolutely dishonest, dishonest. So, if we are not sure that the summit may bring one or two substantial results in the security (?measures), that there is no improvement in the political environment which Sergey already has mentioned, it's (?my difficulty) really, how you can go over there, what for? To talk about what?

[Kuznetsov] Professor Plekhanov, a question to you. Just the other day I came across a very curious report saying that members of the House Armed Services Committee have said that the purported Soviet violations amount to a hill of beans in military terms and that the President was in danger of shooting himself in the foot over them. How can any government risk everything, put in jeopardy such things as national security, arms control, bilateral and multilateral relations, over a hill of beans?

[Plekahanov] I think that the reason why the Reagan administration has been so mindless in its approach to arms control and to the SALT II treaty is that they, for some reason, they believe that the United States will be better off in international politics if it does not bind itself with any kind of obligations to other countries. If it's just basing its polices on the military might that they have, on the economic power that they have, and if they just force others.

[Bogdanov] Sergey I'm sorry, don't forget star wars. Ibelieve star wars plays a very important role, too.

[Plekhanov] That's right. You must have some trump cards. If you throw away the things which were valuable to your predecessors then you must have some trump cards, and they think that the SDI is their trump card, that they will be able to use that in order to force such conditions as they want. But that kind of a game is very reckless; it's bound to damage the interests of the United States itself, not to mention the interests of others. It's really shooting themselves in the foot.

[Bogdanov] Yes, Sergey, and I would like to add to that another aspect of the story which is trying to exhaust the Soviet Union economically. [Words indistinct] moralists, great moralists in Washington. They don't talk about that openly, but it is all [words indistinct].

[Plekhanov] Well, sometimes they even talk about it openly.

[Bogdanov] [Words indistinct] the Soviet Union are not able to sustain such an arms race, we will exhaust them to pieces. Where is the moral?

[Plekhanov] We have little time for technicalities in our program, but still there is one thing that deserves being seen as rather important. The Pentagon and the administration say that they are not seeking any superiority over the Soviet Union but just catching up with the Soviet Union in land-based weapons. The thing is, however, that the structure of the Soviet and American arsenals, strategic arsenals, is different. The majority of Soviet deterrents, or about 70 percent, is on land-based missiles while only 30 percent of the American nuclear forces is on land-based missiles.

Now their, the remaining, two legs are sea-based weapons on nuclear subs and long-range cruise missiles. When the American Administration says it will catch up and skips any mention of the other two legs of the triad, this, in my view, means that they are going to perpetuate their lead, that they are going out for a strong military lead in the strategic forces.

[Kuznetsov] That's right, and the problem's not only with the numbers, and by the way. the numbers of warheads on strategic missiles and bombers is now larger with the United States than with the Soviet Union. We call it a rough parity, rough parity because they have more warheads. But the important thing is not that, that it's not just the numbers of warheads. It's also things like accuracy, the way you deploy your forces. In that area the United States is clearly trying to achieve a configuration and a structure of their military forces, their nuclear potential, so as to be able to acquire a capability to disarm the Soviet Union in a preemptive strike. This is a mad theory. I mean really mad because, no matter how accurate your missiles are, you will never be able to disarm your opponent and the opponent will be able to strike back. So this, this is really nonsense. But the problem is that that nonsense is believed in very seriously, and policies are based on it, and that creates danger.

The decision to break out of the SALT II treaty by the end of the year fits very neatly, in my view, with the overall approach of the Reagan administration to arms control. Take such issues as nuclear testing, as reductions of conventional or chemical weapons as we propose. At the same time the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Treaty allies have once again come up with major peace offers in Budapest during a regular meeting of the Political Consultative Committee. These offers complement those that were already put forward in the past and including the Soviet plan of nuclear disarmament by the end of the century. Professor Bogdanov, what chances are there for these peace offers to succeed?

[Bogdanov] First of all, let's make it public for our listeners over there, and I believe that they should be well assured of the reality of that subject which is a very important one -- conventional arms, what to do with the conventional arms. But to be frank with you, I'm afraid that we will hear another "no" from Washington, as if the English language has no other word but it's a very, very rich language, because this administration has been programed in that way. And they have started already a very dangerous process of destruction, destruction of the whole structure of the arms control network in the Soviet-American relations. Mainly, they're so ambitious that they want to please all of us with some comprehensive Reagan's plan of arms control and things like that. But you know, I do not believe that the way can be first to destroy everything, including the mutual trust and start something else when you have something like 3 years, or even less than 3 years left of this administration. It makes the whole show very, very doubtful, because, my suspicion is, whatever they are doing now has one aim -- to try to tie up the hands of the next administration, that the next administration carries on the so-called Reagan revolution in that field too.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, our time is up. I'd like to thank you and the listeners and invite them to tune in again a week from now at the same time and on the same wavelengths. I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host on "Top Priority," a weekly panel discussion of major world events.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

IZVESTIYA LIKENS PERLE SALT COMMENT TO JOSEPH MCCARTHY

PML80805 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Melor Sturua article: "In the Wake of McCarthy"]

[Text] Last Friday U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Joseph Perle spoke at a dinner given in his honor by the "Heritage Foundation" private research organization--the think tank of U.S. extreme right-wingers. But surely Perle is called Richard, not Joseph, I hear the informed reader say. So he was. For some time now he has clearly changed name and will obviously change his surname to McCarthy too. Yes, yes, if this writer believed in the migration of souls he would not doubt for one minute that the soul of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy had migrated to Richard Perle's mortal body.

Firday's Heritage Foundation dinner is quite eloquent evidence of that. As is well known, McCarthy was famed for his "witch-hunts." His allegation that the U.S. State Department had virtually become a "nest of Communists" attained particularly scandalous notoriety. Mr Perle has followed the beaten track. After a pleasant dessert he made an absolutely indigestible statement, accusing the State Department of "preventing" the NATO leaders from being informed about "violations by the Russians of agreements in the arms control sphere and the need to continue U.S. nuclear weapons tests." Perle excelled himself. "It is simply disgraceful!" he exclaimed.

The cause of Perle-McCarthy's ire is the negative reaction of the U.S. European NATO allies to Washington's virtual denouncement of the interim SALT I agreement and the SALT II Treaty. Of course, it could have been suggested to Mr Perle that this position is the fruit of information rather than ignorance. But Mr Perle and the soul of McCarthy within him are not in tune with logic. That is why the "immune" members of his audience also got an earful.

After the State Department and the European NATO leaders Perle set about Congress, most of whose members are also not ecstatic about the speed with which people are violating highly important treaties. Speaking not at the Heritage Foundation dinner but at a stormy 4-hour hearing in one of the House Armed Services subcommittees, Perle issued this ultimatum: "Either Congress is in solidarity with the administration or it is in solidarity with

the Russians." Perle was particularly angered by a bill put forward by Congressman Norman Dicks of Washington envisaging the blocking of appropriations for U.S. nuclear arms, production of which will entail exceeding the SALT II limits.

Perle's eloquence, as THE WASHINGTON POST put it, made Dicks "red with anger." Answering Perle, Dicks said that the former was "making too bold in discussing the legislative and executive branches of authority." Dicks also reminded Perle that during his stint as aide to Senator Henry Jackson he had "outdone everyone in undermining" SALT II.

Congressman Thomas Downey of New York also joined in the combat. "Compared to you," he told Perle, "the character in George Orwell's '1984' whose task is to rewrite history is a babe in arms."

Congressman Downey was very close to the truth, very close. If Perle rewrites his surname as McCarthy and his first name as Joseph, that is his business. But when he and his bosses rewrite, or, rather, cross out international legal documents of the utmost importance on whose observance the fate of world peace largely depends, that is quite another matter. This is what Thomas O'Neill, speaker of the House of Representatives, said about him when summing up the results of the skirmish: "The administration has taken its foot off the brake on nuclear arms deployment and is about to step on the gas in nuclear weapons production."

That is why Mr Perle is now stepping on the gas of McCarthyism.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

FRG PAPERS COMMENT ON REAGAN SALT II DECLARATION

Press Review

DW051015 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 5 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Text] One of today's editorial topics is the dispute about SALT II.

LUEBECKER NCHRICHTEN writes: The situation is paradoxical. For some 7 years ago the U.S. Government has adhered to SALT II, which had been achieved after long efforts, although it has not beenadopted by the Senate. Today it is believed that a congressional majority would support the arms control treaty. However, now the White Housse does not want to have anything to do with it. In the West — in the United States as well as in Europe — the lack of understanding for the U.S. President's new course is taking shape as a political counterinitiative. Reagan must realize there will be growing resistance — in his own camp even more than from the Soviet Union. Neither the allies nor many members of Congress want to abandon SALT II as long as there are no substantial chances for a treaty limiting strategic weapons.

SCHWARZWAELDER BOTE notes: The sharpest reaction to President Reagan's announcement that he does not feel bound by SALT II was heard yesterday from Moscow. Abandoning the treaty would jeopardize not only the planned second summit meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev, it could also touch off USSR military countermeasures, warned high-ranking officials. Whether the U.S. President had considered that possibility sufficiently when he let the Soviet Union know what it would have to expect if it did not act according to U.S. expectations remains a question.

The Freiburg *BADISCHE ZEITUNG* maintains: The angry Soviet reaction to the broadside fired by President Reagan at SALT II had been expected by the U.S. Government. However, it seems to be surprised by the extent of West European irritation. Now the U.S. Government is trying pacification, pointing out that it was not Reagan's final word, but that he has left a final decision on eliminating the SALT II restrictions open until the end of the year.

Newspaper Editorial

DW050942 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 5 Jun 86 p 3

[Editorial by "GRO": "Ice Age"]

[Text] SALT II never got through the U.S. Congress, it was never ratified, and thus it was never legally valid. In practice, however, it was the underlying basis for relations between the two superpowers. That seems to be changing radically now.

The deployment of "Eurostrategic" weapons systems (Pershing-2 and cruise missiles on one side, SS-20 missiles on the other) has aggravated tensions — as indicated by the protest movement and the opposition, but ignored by the Bonn coalition and the big brothers in Washington; however, it was not a question of SALT. There was still hope that the superpowers would still maintain what is called common sense.

A new cold war is in the offing. Ronald Reagan and particularly his secretary, Caspar Weinberger, want to see more weapons; they want to see SALT II disappear into the archives — shelved as "illusions" or "deceptions." Soviet Chief of General Staff Akhromeyev and the other Kremlin leaders will follow suit. At the end of the American's term in office, a president who has been praised for guaranteeing future peace, the most dangerous situation of postwar times is developing. The only question is whether it is the beginning of an ice age or the beginning of the end.

Papers View Bundestag Debate, SALT

DW061056 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 6 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Text] Some of the editorials today discuss the Bundestag disarmament debate.

BRAUNSCHWEIGER ZEITUNG writes: While the parties in the election campaign feel committed to stressing their differences, hardly anyone notes the occasional thing they have in common. The same was true in the Bundestag disarmament debate. All the factions shared uneasiness over the U.S. announcement that it would no longer adhere to SALT II. That is clearly expressed in the Bundestag majority decision addressed to Washington. As the Federal Government is fulfilling its alliance commitment loyally, in contrast to some other European allies, the U.S. Government cannot ignore the German voice. That voice also speaks to the East although, regrettably, with only half the volume. The SPD and the Greens do not want to join the appeal addressed simultaneously to the Soviet Union to slow its armament down so that the Americans will not implement their SALT II threat, which is connected to that condition. That is regrettable, because as a result German pressure to make the two major powers cooperate on disarmament will lose much of its conviction and political weight.

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU notes: Granted, the U.S. Congress never ratified SALT II, and it would have expired last year anyway. However, Moscow and Washington agreed to adhere to the agreed ceilings. There was some stability, despite the deteriorated U.S.-Soviet relations. It was at least a hope, but the American step came as a shock. What will follow now, is the question. Even more mass destruction weapons? An end to the arms control process? A new cold war? For a great number of Bonn politicans, even in the government parties, the recent U.S. action was somehow too much. CDU Deputy Volker Ruehe did not suppress his criticism. At any rate, the task of the defenders of U.S. policy has become more difficult.

The Bonn *GENERAL-ANZEIGER* states: In contrast to the Europeans, Washington sees no sense in sticking to SALT II if Moscow refuses tto agree to verifiable disarmament steps in a constantly changing field as weapons technology. That is the core of the conflict of political opinion between the United States and its European allies.

Genscher on European, U.S. Views

LD071140 Hamburg DPA in German 1035 GMT 7 Jun 86

[Excerpts] Hagen, 7 Jun (DPA) — Hans-Dietrich Genscher, federal foreign minister, launched a sharp attack on the Greens at Hagen on Saturday at the North Rhine-Westphalia land FDP congress.

On energy policy, Genscher called for "increased efforts for research into nonnuclear sources of energy". These efforts were not good enough in the past. He regretted that "the publicly disbursed research funds for nuclear energy are considerably higher than those for nonnuclear energy". It would be correct to "alter this wrong relationship in favor of renewable energy sources."

The foreign minister regretted that the criticism by Europeans of the U.S. withdrawal from the SALT II treaty was misinterpreted in the United States. "What a misunderstanding of an alliance!" Genscher said. "We understand the alliance as a league of democracies, in which everyone can speak his mind. However imperfect" SALT II might be, the Federal Republic "would adhere to the agreement as long as there is no better one." (?It would be better) "if the United States and the USSR practiced what Reagan and Gorbachev stated in Geneva, namely the halving of their missile potential."

Press Analyzes Reagan's Statements

DW131001 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 13 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Text] Press editorials today deal with President Reagan's press conference given on Wednesday night in Washington. The United States attitude to SALT II was involved, which the president declared — literally — as being dead.

AUGSBURGER ALLGEMEINE comments on Reagan's attitude as follows: On the one hand he defended his decision, criticized by his allies, no longer to consider SALT II the ceiling for strategic weapons. On the other hand, however, he made it clear that the very last word had not been spoken. The aim is clear: Through some verbal muscle-flexing the Soviet Union is to become uncertain, end its alleged SALT II violations, and look to Geneva for disarmament compromises. Reagan can afford this game of poker. He is under no domestic political pressure, and demarches by European allies are currently not worth much in Washington anyway.

DIE WELT writes: The extraordinary care with which Ronald Reagan in his White House press conference dealt with Mikhail Gorbachev's goodwill, was more than diplomatic courtesy. It was a signal. Reagan praised the Kremlin chief as being the first Soviet Leader ever to suggest on his own the idea of reducing and even abolishing nuclear weapons. The President addressed his words to the tangibly cooler climate between Moscow and Washington. He did it at a time when many critics, in misinterpreting his Salt decision, accuse him of steering a confrontation course with Moscow and endangering the entire disarmament dialogue. The careful dealing with Gorbachev, the tangible leeway Reagan left for himself in the interpretation of his SALT decision, and the fact that the Soviets have made two new disarmament proposals since the Salt decision, proves that the predicted ice age is not in sight.

KOELNISCHE RUNDSCHAU maintains: Reagan is no more the unscrupulous warmonger than is Gorbachev the selfless angel of peace. The Americans have had problems for some time with SALT II, the invalid but respected treaty. Without much of an effort they could increase their military strike force considerably, but the agreement negotiated under Carter hinders them from doing it. At the same time they must endure the Soviet cavalier treatment of the agreement. The Russians deploy their SS-25 missiles and state stubbornly that it is not a new weapon development, which would not be permissible under SALT. There are a number of Soviet weapons initiatives suspected of being incompatible with Salt. Now the Americans want to catch up. However, it will certainly end in more than mere quantitive and qualitative equality.

The Leutkirch *SCHWAEBISCHE ZEITUNG* points out: The main question in view of Reagan's statements is what is mere tactics and what is usable substance? Before rebuilding detente, one should take stock carefully. During the negotiations on the SALT II agreement, Soviet missile production reached a peak. When the treaty was almost ready, president Carter withdraw the document after the invasion of Afghanistan. President Reagan now considers the never-ratified agreement as flawed. He demand a new agreement with reliable verification. That approach is honest and realistic — so much so that it must be painful to Europeans. The appeals of the European partners to the leading Western power to continue to adhere to Salt II are understable. From a German point of view it would even be logical. On the European border between East and West people live in densely populated areas that would be a battlefield if the East-West balance failed.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2706

SALT/START ISSUES

KARPOV COMMENTS ON REAGAN SALT II DECISION'S IMPACT

DW152157 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 1800 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Interview with Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation to the Geneva disarmament negotiatons, by correspondent Dierk-Ludwig Schaaf, in the Soviet Embassy in Bonn -- questions in German, answers in Russian with superimposed German translation -- recorded]

[Text] [Schaaf] The U.S. Administration reproaches the USSR with having violated SALT II.

[Karpov] That is a mere pretext. Now the U.S. armament program is beginning to be incompatible with SALT II. That is the real reason.

[Schaaf] What are the consequences for the Geneva disarmament negotiations if the U.S. Administration no longer accepts SALT II?

[Karpov] That will have extremely negative effects. Besides there is the U.S. intention to build the SDI program and to extend the arms-race into space. All that means considerable additional complications for the Geneva negotiations.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR'S FALIN ON SALT II DECISION'S IMPACT ON SUMMIT

AU161324 Vienna VOLKSSTIMMT in German 14 Jun 86 p 3

["Excerpt" of an interview given by Valentin Falin, Soviet journalist and former USSR ambassador to the FRG, to Franz Sommerfeld, editor in chief of the FRG weekly DVZ/DIE TAT--date and place not given]

[Excerpts] Sommerfeld: The U.S. Administration is planning armament measures for autumn that would violate SALT II.

Falin: If this is confirmed, the entire arms control issue will be made much more difficult. This is the continuation of a negative development of the American policy, a development that constitutes a great dnager to all of mankind.

Sommerfeld: Would this endanger the second summit meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev this year?

Falin: It would not make the second summit easier, that is obvious, if the Americans adhere to this policy, because the meaning of a new meeting between the general secretary and the President consists in solving problems and not in describing the problems and ensuing difficulties.

Sommerfeld: Has the spirit of Geneva disappaeared?

Falin: In substance, yes. The American side has acted on purpose -- at least that it is how it seems -- in such a way that as little as possible is left of the spirit, and not only of the spirit but also of the letter, of Geneva.

Sommerfeld: Do you see any indicaitons for a change in this development?

Falin: There are no indications for such a change.

Sommerfeld: So you are pessimistic?

Falin: Not pessimistic, but realistic!

The Americans Do Not Want an Understanding.

Sommerfeld: Does your assessment also apply to the disarmament negotiations currently under way?

Falin: The Americans want neither a settlement nor an understanding with us. They need tension in order to continue their military program. This is the real reason for the difficulties in all negotiations that are still being held. If they really wanted arms control, they would not question the existing agreements and treaties; they would pursue a totally different philosophy.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

FURTHER SOVIET COMMENTARIES ASSAILING REAGAN SALT II DECISION

Contradicts 1985 Summit

AU091150 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 6 Jun 86 p 4

[Article by Spartak Beglov, "APN Political Observer: "'Ideology' and Missiles." "especially written for RABOTNICHESKO DELO"]

[Text] In warning Washington that it could not remain indifferent to the refusal to observe SALT II, (as well as the SALT I agreement of 1972 on reducing strategic weapons), the USSR did not mean merely to underline the need to reject a new round of the arms race in the area of strategic nuclear weapons. This is so because the issue here is indeed the entire concept of international security at the threshold of the 21st century and the stability factors and strategic situation, the preserving and strengthening of which are vital to prevent the world from sliding toward a nuclear catastrophe.

Yes, this is no separate episode in the two states' relations in the military area. Gerhard Smith, one of the "godfathers" of the strategic weapons agreements, and a former leader of the U.S. delegation to the SALT I talks, has correctly assessed what has occurred. According to him Washington's intention to abandon in the final account observance of SALT II has an "ideological character," and has been adopted under pressure by opponents of disarmament.

Actually, what "ideology" can be mentioned when the issue in question is the arms production line? The matter is simple -- it is impossible to stop this production line while thinking in the old manner.

The "three whales" [referring to old Slav saying, according to which the world is supported by three whales] on which this "ideology" rests, professed by militarists of all periods, which have repeatedly brought tragic consequences for mankind, are these: The first -- power as the main issue in relations with other countries; the second -- you can develop your own security only at the expense of other countries' security; and third -- you must rely on military means, not on the political process, if you want to achieve real security.

Under the present U.S. Administration, whose high priest of the cult of power is Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, this "ideology" has reached its apex. It was not by chance that on the eve of the November 1985 Geneva meeting between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, after unsuccessfully trying to foil the meeting, the

Pentagon chief in fact issued an ultimatum to the master of the White House, whose essence was that in Geneva a confirmation of the U.S. adherence to SALT II was to be avoided at all costs, if the support of the military and ultra-militarist circles was still wanted.

The Soviet leader's position upon arriving in Geneva was completely different: First: the survival of mankind depends on how profoundly everybody understands that cooperation among states must prevail over the arguments of power.

Second -- that the security of one state cannot be guaranteed without coordinating it with the interest of other states. Third -- that political decisions and the process of negotiating are the key to a reliable system of security throughout the world, and not the arms race for creating new generations of mass destruction weapons. After the Geneva meeting in the spirit of the new thinking, the USSR proposed a disarmament plan and a general system of international security. The confusion in the ranks of Washington's hawks developed into vicious resistance. It is not necessary now to list all the demonstrations of the U.S. policy of power that marred international life during the first half of this year.

The U.S. leading circles, which have close relations with the military-industrial complex, are trying to present things in a way that is aimed at creating the impression that there is no way out of the vicious circle of the arms race. Not only is the goal to discredit the Soviet peace program, but there is also a clear intention to impose on the USSR something like a "disarmament race." The essence of this intention is clear -- the Soviet program for radical measures in the area of disarmament is closely connected with the plans to sharply accelerate the country's development and double production and the people's prosperity by the end of the century.

According to the ideological canons of the U.S. "ultras," this is unacceptable. They see as the worst thing for themselves the fact that the new way of thinking, so brilliantly demonstrated by Moscow, would pull the rug out from under their feet. One cannot avoid the conclusion that the U.S. leading circles are not convinced that the historical dispute between the two systems will end in their favor, if this dispute continues under peaceful conditions. Simultaneously, the White House does not shun the use of the methods of "psychological war" even against its own population. Speculating with the lack of information of many Americans, the leading circles constantly disseminate myths about Soviet violations of SALT II. In fact, the new U.S. missiles have simply reached the "ceilings" of the agreement and have made it an uncomfortable one to have.

All this contradicts not only the spirit but also the letter of the Geneva meeting. Did the two leaders not sign a joint declaration in November 1985, on renouncing attempts to achieve military superiority? What has remained from Geneva for the next summit? Such a summit would make sense only if the situation preceding it corresponds to the character of the November 1985 agreements, and if it produces decisions on the great questions of security and stopping the arms race. Defending this position, Moscow expects Washington to produce signals in the spirit of the new thinking and not in the spirit of the obsolete "ideology" of confrontation, which has some very dangerous connotations. Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev said recently that the USSR is ready for compromise decisions, but will never succumb to pressure -- regardless of whether it is military, political, or economic.

'Worst Conclusions' Confirmed

LD131700 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Commentary by Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military affairs observer]

[Text] Moscow, 13 Jun (TASS) -- Washington has quite plainly stated that the United States is finally abandoning the 1979 Soviet-U.S. treaty on the limiting strategic weapons. "Salt II no longer exists. It is dead," White House spokesman Larry Speakes stated officially.

The very manner of presenting this decision by President Reagan to the world public confirms observers' worst conclusions of the genuine direction of U.S. foreign policy.

Certain critics of the President, who asserted that allegedly Reagan does not know where he is leading matters by virtue of his simplemindedness [po prostote dushevnoy], proved to be completely wrong.

Having already signed the decree on equipping 131 strategic bombers with cruise missiles, which means openly undermining SALT II, Reagan nevertheless made attempts to proceed with the renunciation of the treaty while keeping the brakes on. His contradictory statements, first about the willingness of the United States to violate SALT II, then the hints at the possibility of its being retained, and then finally the not too courageous decision to announce via a second-grade official that the treaty was finally being renounced, all indicate that the President knows full well what he is embarking on but is afraid of assuming responsibility for it.

The SALT II agreement has created a number of effective barriers to the nuclear arms race. It sets limits for both sides on the numbers of strategic weapon delivery vehicles, limited the number of warheads on long-range missiles, put a ban on obstacles to the operation of observation satellites, precluded the possibility of certain classes of particularly dangerous missiles being deployed, and made provision for a number of pledges by the sides whose observation reduced the danger of nuclear war.

Despite all the differences in the approaches by the USSR and the United States to problems of war and peace, up until 1981 there was a certain community of views between the sides regarding ways of maintaining stability and the danger of destabilizing the military-political situation. Previous U.S. Administrations recognized the risk of an absolutely uncontrolled nuclear arms race and tried to avoid situations in which vitally important decisions would have to be taken in just a few minutes during which events could get out of people's control. It was this very community of views on certain global problems that made it possible by 1979 to achieve a number of important agreements on curbing the arms race, including SALT II.

One gets the impression that the current U.S. Administration does not share the generally recognized views on the danger of a destabilization of the military-political situation and the catastrophic consequences of an uncontrolled arms race. This is precisely why it recklessly discarded the 1972 interim agreement [SALT I] and SALT II and is taking an action that jeopardizes the treaty on ABM system limitation, the banning of nuclear tests in the three environments, and the principles of activites by states in space.

Before the 1984 presidential elections the people close to Ronald Reagan constantly stressed in their public statements that the master of the White House wanted to go down in history as a peacemaker. It is now quite clear that either those statements were completely groundless, or else the President himself has decided there should be no history at all.

U.S. Seeks 'Superiority'

LD121442 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Aleksandr Druzhinin commentary]

[Text] The impression is that the President's chief goal was to shield the United States of [as heard] the sharp criticism of its intention to undermine the SALT II treaty, voiced even by America's allies. Much was said at the news conference about Washington's desire to contain the arms race. However, the President admitted that he was always opposed to SALT II. In fact he confirmed that already this autumn American was going to go beyond the treaty's limits on the number of advanced cruise missiles to be deployed on B-52 bombers.

All this indicates that Washington's course towards torpedoing the treaty and crudely breaching the strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States remains unchanged.

Washington thinks of further building up its arsenals rather than of restraint, so vital for solving the problems of ending the arms race. This is borne out by a statement made by yet another high-ranking Washington administration official, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger. Addressing NATO's military officials recently, he said that the naval forces of the United States and its partners should expand the sphere of their actions to cover the world ocean as a whole. Mr Weinberger made it absolutely clear that Washington would rely in the future on the extensive armed support by NATO countries of American actions similar to the recent U.S. aggression against Libya. So as we see, Washington's intentions should be judged by its actions rather than by the Reagan administration's peace rhetoric. And these actions show that the escalation of the offensive arms race and reliance on global U.S. military superiority have always underlaid Washington's approach to international problems.

Numerical Ceilings Discussed

LD171741 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1214 GMT 17 Jun 86

[TASS Observer Leonid Ponomarev: "Washington's Course -- Toward the Escalation of the Arms Race"]

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jun (TASS) -- Tomorrow marks the 7th anniversary of the signing in Vienna of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on limiting strategic offensive weapons, generally known as SALT II. Almost the same number of years passed before the document was signed. These years were spent on elaboration and careful assessment by each side on the "pros" and "cons" of the agreements. The 15th anniversary of the constructive process of concrete searches by the Soviet Union and the United States for accords on curbing the arms race could have been marked with satisfaction no later than in a year's time if the United States kept to the obligations it had undertaken, and the White House did not finally torpedo the treaty with its decision of 27 May to reject SALT II.

What are the reasons for this? The fact is that the Pentagon approached that threshold when the SALT II accords stood as a rigid barrier on the path of building up the strategic capabilities of the United States.

It is true that SALT II also limits the level of strategic forces of the Soviet Union, but unlike Washington, Moscow welcomes these limitations for both sides, and is ready to lower the limits defined by SALT II.

U.S. Administration representatives claim that SALT II allegedly "does not limit" the build-up of strategic weapons, and Washington, so they say, would like to have "genuine control" over armaments. However, one only has to glance at the text of the treaty and it becomes clear that it most seriously limits the opportunities for increasing the strategic forces of the two sides and establishes their concrete "ceilings." Thus, the original total level was defined as 2,400 units of strategic weapons [yedinits strategicheskikh sredstv] for each side, and if the treaty were ratified by the U.S. Senate, this level would be lowered to 2,250 units. Corresponding "ceilings" are also envisaged for the main groups of strategic systems -- 1,320 units for ballistic missiles with multiple independently-targetted reentry vehicles and for heavy bombers with their armaments; 1,200 units for ballistic missiles (without bombers) with multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles; finally, no more than 820 units of ICBM's with multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles.

From the moment of signing the treaty the Soviet Union dismantled 72 ICBM launchers and 21 heavy bombers, and overall dismantled 540 strategic carriers according to the provisional SALT I and the SALT II agreements. The United States dismantled 168 units. If no limitations existed according to SALT II, each side could increase the number of warheads approximately from 6,000 to 28,000 by the year 1995, according to the estimates of the research service of the U.S. Congress.

Having discarded SALT II, the present U.S. Administration is promising the public that it will strive for "a better treaty" with the Soviet Union "for the purposes of limiting arms arsenals." These are simply words, a propaganda ploys. By "a better treaty" Washington means a screen ensuring that the United States achieves military superiority over the Soviet Union. But these are illusory calculations since the USSR will never allow the United States to have nuclear missile superiority. In its international relations, including with the United States, the Soviet side rigorously holds by the principle of equality and identical security for the sides.

'Blatant' U.S. SALT, ABM Violations

PM171611 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 86 First Edition p 4

[I. Nikolayev article: "Irresponsible Policy"]

[Text] Following President Reagan's 27 May statement on the de facto U.S. refusal to observe in the future the obligations stemming from the Soviet-American legal treaty documents on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons, no doubt at all remains that the present U.S. Administration has taken a course of eliminating the last real obstacles in the way of an unrestrained arms race, primarily in the sphere of mass destruction weapons. We are talking about the 1972 Interim Agreement and the 1979 SALT II Treaty, which prevent the U.S. leadership from embarking on a new round of the arms race and extending it into space -- which would threaten mankind with what are essentially irreversible consequences.

The 31 May Soviet Government statement has already given a principled assessment of these U.S. Government actions. One ought, however, to pay particular attention to one fact. As a justification for its irresponsible policy, U.S. diplomacy makes unsubstantiated references to some "violations" of the aforementioned legal treaty documents by the Soviet side. The Soviet side has already and repeatedly provided detailed and specific explanations of the alleged violations of these treaties, convincingly refuting these accusations as totally groundless. There is no need to turn back to this here.

There is, however, another aspect to this question. While accusing the Soviet Union of nonobservance of SALT II obligations, the Americans have themselves repeatedly given highly serious grounds for doubt regarding their observance of the obligation undertaken by the United States to adhere to the SALT II provisions, the accords reached under the 1972 Interim Agreement, and -- and this is equally dangerous for peace -- the most important provisions of the ABM Treaty of unlimited duration. The U.S. behavior cannot be described other than as a crude violation by the U.S. side of obligations it has undertaken, as irresponsible and extremely dangerous actions shaking the very foundations of the process of limiting the arms race.

U.S. Actions Contrary to the SALT II Treaty and the 1972 Interim Agreement:

By deploying Pershing-2 ballistic missiles and long-range cruise missiles in West Europe, the United States is acting contrary to Article XII of the SALT II Treaty which prohibits the circumvention of its provisions in any manner.

In the course of the talks, the sides agreed that circumvention means any action leading to a disruption of the strategic balance established by the treaty. The Pershing-2 and cruise missiles being deployed in Europe and capable of reaching Soviet territory are strategic weapons with respect to the Soviet Union, and the potential of these weapons is in no way inferior to that of ICBM's, SLBM's, or ALCM's defined by the sides as strategic weapons. Building up an additional strategic potential in evasion of the strategic balance established by the SALT II Treaty, the United States is in direct breach of the treaty by carrying out an action prohibited by its Article XII.

Work whose nature makes it possible to assume that an ICBM launch silo is being constructed there is being carried out at the Warren missile base in the United States. A special cover has been set up over the work site, preventing Soviet national technical means from observing the work. This provides sufficient grounds for asserting that at the Warren base, the American side is violating the provisions prohibiting the construction of additional stationary ICBM launchers and the disguising of work being carried out.

The American side followed the practice of using covers over launch silos back in the seventies, in defiance of the Interim Agreement. At that time, the United States concealed the nature of the reequipping of Minuteman-2 ICBM launch silos. After being reequipped, they hardly differ in any way from Minuteman-3 launchers. This, according to all the rules of military logic, indicated that the United States had prepared them to house precisely Minuteman-3's as MIRV'D missiles.

The United States does not wish to be tied down in any way on procedural issues either. Thus, in dismantling the Titan-2 silo launchers, it is simply ignoring the compulsory procedures elaborated by the sides to ensure monitoring of observance of the treaty's provisions. It is clear that this in no way promotes confidence in the fulfillment of the pledges adopted by the United States.

U.S. Actions at Variance with the 1972 ABM Treaty:

The ABM Treaty of unlimited duration, signed by the U.S. president and ratified by Congress, obliges both sides not to deploy ABM systems for a defense of their national territories and not to create a base for such a defense. The ABM Treaty is undoubtedly the most important of the treaty bases on which all existing strategic arms limitations rest. Of course, without limitations on the ABM systems which constitute its substance, it is no use even thinking of any real measures aimed at limiting strategic offensive arms.

Even if we do not dwell on the declarative U.S. intentions to renounce the ABM Treaty in the near future, there are considerable grounds for describing certain actions already taken by the United States as direct and blatant violations of the ABM Treaty by the American side. In addition, there are grounds for assuming that the United States is already taking steps directed against this treaty.

Thus, the U.S. Administration proclaimed and adopted the SDI program, whose chief aim is the creation [sozdaniye] of an ABM defense of U.S. national territory with prohibited space-based elements. This aim is directly opposed to the chief substance of the ABM Treaty -- the prohibition of an ABM defense of a country's national territory and also, in particular, of space-based components. Tens of billions of dollars have been allocated to work on implementing these programs. A number of Western states are involved in implementing them internationally. A number of large-scale experiments have already been conducted, and they undoubtedly go beyond what might still be termed "research work," which, as the Americans understand it, is "not prohibited by the treaty." Thus, violations, of a number of basic provisions of the ABM Treaty in the course of implementing the American SDI program are quite obvious.

Against a background of loud talk about the supposed creation in the USSR of radar stations intended for territorial ABM systems, the United States itself for some years now has been deploying, both on its territory and abroad, large radar stations of the "Pave Paws" type with parameters virtually indistinguishable from those of ABM radar stations. Such stations are deployed both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of America and are quite capable of serving as the basis for the creation of ABM defense for the whole of U.S. territory. The creation of the large phased array radar station at Thule (Greenland) may be cited as an instance of a U.S. breach of the ABM Treaty. This construction is being carried out contrary to the provision of the ABM Treaty, which permits the deployment of a radar station of this type only on the periphery of a country's national territory. The construction of a similar radar station is also planned in the Fylingdales region in England.

Despite repeated Soviet representations to the U.S. side in connection with the deployment of the aforementioned radar stations, the latter has taken no measures capable of allaying concern, nor is it dismantling the Thule radar station, whose deployment can only be termed a violation of the ABM Treaty. When speaking about those U.S. actions in breach of the ABM Treaty, mention must also be made of the tests of MIRV'D warheads intended for ABM missiles, the creation of ABM radar stations, and the tests of an ABM missile created on the basis of ICBM's.

The list of U.S. violations of agreements on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments and the ABM Treaty could go on. But the examples that have been cited are sufficient to draw a clear and simple conclusion. The U.S. actions aimed against those treaties are neither coincidentral nor uncoordinated and isolated. They adequately reflect the entire U.S. aggressive militarist policy based on the illusory pursuit of unilateral strategic advantages and represent a futile attempt to ensure America's own security and stability at the expense of others by means of an unrestrained arms race. Such a policy threatens unpredictable consequences for all mankind.

'Dangers' Listed

LD191500 Moscow TASS in English 1444 GMT 19 Jun 86

["Foundation of Detente Should Not be Destroyed" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow, June 19 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

In the communique of the Budapest meeting, the Warsaw treaty member countries once again reaffirmed their adherence to the agreements in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament and urged the United States to observe strictly the agreements on strategic arms limitation.

But the U.S. Administration refuses to heed the voice of reason, persists with its policy aimed at destroying the foundation of the process of detente, the foundation that had earlier been created by joint efforts of the two states for the further advance in arms reduction and limitation. The decision announced by the head of the White House to refuse to observe the Soviet-U.S. legal documents on strategic offensive arms limitation means an action that imposes a serious qualitative change on the international situation.

What are the dangers posed by this unilateral step by Washington? First, a deliberate large-scale breach of the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty attests to Washington's discarding the fundamental principle of the Soviet-U.S. relations -- the principle of equality and equal security on which this treaty rests. This means an outright attempt to achieve military advantages, to disrupt the military parity reached by the USSR and the USA, the parity which is the basis of strategic stability in the world.

Second, dismantling the existing material restrictions on the arms race, the United States opens the way for the uncontrolled build-up of armaments, thus jeopardizing the security of everyone, its own included. Resuming actually all military programmes which were dropped for some or other reasons by the previous administrations and embarking on the programme of the construction of heavy arms in all components of the U.S. strategic triad, the programme unprecedented for its scale, the present U.S. Administration discards the commitments assumed by those administrations as they come into contradiction with the implementation of the new U.S. military programmes.

Third, by its actions official Washington actually restricts the possibility of advance along the road of arms limitation and reduction. The U.S. Administration has done absolutely nothing to take practical measures for the implementation of the aim jointly proclaimed by the USSR and the USA -- that of terminating the arms race on earth and preventing its spread to space. Due to the efforts of the U.S. Administration, the Soviet-U.S. Talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva are skidding. The U.S. stand sharply complicated the matters at the talks, specifically in the group on strategic arms. Despite the growing indignation in the world and condemnation of Washington's policy, the U.S. Administration has no wish to adjust it in a positive direction. U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger just said that the SALT-2 treaty is "dated" and threatened the U.S. Congress that if it adopts a resolution on keeping within the quantitative limits set by the treaty, the President will be viewing it as unconstitutional. The Pentagon's chief confirmed again that another important treaty, on the limitation of ABM systems, is also threatened. He said he would declare against any steps that could limit the U.S. right to terminate the observance of that treaty. They in Washington refuse to realize their responsibility to the present and coming generations. And it is high time to understand that the negative stance of the U.S. Administration on key questions of war and peace is fraught with grave consequences for humanity and really threatens to turn our planet into a lifeless spectre.

SALT II Not Obsolete

PM231341 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 20 Jun 86 p 3

[Own international observer G. Dadyants answers readers' questions under new rubric "Dialogue With Readers": "Apres Eux le Deluge;" first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Today we are opening a new rubric in our international section. We will conduct a direct dialogue with readers on key questions of international politics. Professor V. Gul, doctor of chemical sciences and RSFSR meritorious figure of science and technology (Moscow), has addressed a number of questions to the editorial office, including some controversial questions about SALT II, G. Dadyants, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA international observer, answers the questions.

Gul: A great deal is being written in the newspapers at the moment about U.S. violations of the Soviet-American SALT II agreement. I would like to ask the following question: How important is the observance of this treaty in present conditions when new talks on the whole range of nuclear and space arms are under way between the USSR and the United States? Perhaps SALT II is indeed obsolete. And, is this perhaps an attempt on the part of the United States to blackmail the Soviet Union in order to gain concessions at the talks?

Dadyants: No, SALT II is not obsolete. Furthermore, the observance of the treaty is obligatory particularly and especially in light of the new Soviet-American talks currently under way in Geneva. What is the essence of SALT II? Above all, this treaty imposes quantitative limits on strategic offensive arms -- the most dangerous and powerful nuclear weapon in the possession of the USSR and the United States. In particular, this treaty sets a strict limit on the number of strategic weapon delivery vehicles equipped with MIRVed warheads for both sides (1,320 units each). This limit as such contains the strategic arms race and therefore facilitates further talks on this question. I would like to mention in this context that the USSR has proposed that the strategic nuclear potential of both sides be reduced by 50 percent of the current level. According to the latest "interim option" introduced by the Soviet side in Geneva, strategic offensive arms are limited to equal levels on both sides. It is within the framework of SALT II that agreement on the further reduction of the strategic nuclear arsenals be sought.

Now, concerning U.S. intentions to violate the treaty, the American side has indeed announced this. First, this was declared by President R. Reagan himself and, subsequently, in still more unequivocal terms by Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger. This Pentagon "hawk" went so far as to describe SALT II as "flawed." Now U.S. spokesmen are openly saying that the treaty is "dead" and that, as far as the United States is concerned, it "no loger exists."

Is there an element of blackmail against the Soviet Union in this? Even that cannot be excluded. Nonetheless, I believe that in this case it is not so much a question of blackmail. Rather it is a question of the U.S. Administration's intention to accelerate the nuclear arms race across the board, including the strategic arms race. The 1979 SALT II treaty and the 1972 Interim Agreement Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms (SALT I) are an impediment to the U.S. aggressive neoglobalist policy. It is no accident that the decision to abandon the observance of SALT II was adopted to the accompaniment of the reverberations of new nuclear explosions in Nevada. It is closely tied up with the desire of the United States to rid itself of another important Soviet-American treaty -- the ABM Treaty -- which hampers the implementation of the SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] program, referred to as "star wars" in common parlance.

A true arms race orgy, including the sphere of strategic arms, has broken out in the United States. In addition to B-52 and B-1B bombers equipped with long-range cruise missiles, it is intended to create [sozdat] a new type of ICBM (Midgetman) and deploy additionally 50 new MX ICBM's. As a result, the U.S. press admits, the limits imposed by SALT II will be exceeded. There is also talk about the creation [sozdaniye] of the "latest cruise missile." Preparations for the creation [sozdaniye] of space-strike arms are proceeding at full speed.

While programs of this kind are being implemented there is no room for international treaties. SALT II -- which incidentally was the result of many years of cooperation between the USSR and the United States in the seventies with a view to ending the nuclear missile arms race and strengthening strategic stability -- is a thorn in the flesh of the present U.S. Administration. Therefore it has decided to abandon it.

Gul: To what extent is SALT II being observed by both sides?

The Americans, for instance, are claiming that the USSR has repeatedly violated this treaty.

Dadyants: No, the Soviet side has not violated this treaty. The Soviet side has implemented and is implementing all its assumed obligations rigorously and in full, the Soviet Government statement on the subject says: In an attempt to justify its own position, Washington is claiming that the USSR "violated" the treaty by deploying two new ICBMs, which is not allowed under the treaty. In effect what they are referring to as "new ICBMs" is the modernized SS-25 missile. I must mention that, while imposing quantitative limits on strategic weapon delivery vehicles and warheads, the treaty by no means bans the modernization of the sides' nuclear potential. Thus the deployment of the missile referred to as the SS-25 in the West is fully within the confines of the treaty. I must also mention that since the signing of the treaties on strategic arms limitation, the USSR has dismantled 72 ICBM launchers and 21 heavy bombers -- a total of 540 delivery vehicles under both the SALT I and II treaties. Over the same period the United States has dismantled only 168 delivery vehicles.

In general it must be said that the United States has long been working toward undermining the strategic arms limitation treaties. It is generally know that SALT II was never ratified by the United States and was observed as a kind of "favor." The deployment on the territory of West European countries of th so-called new "medium range" U.S. missiles -- the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles trained on targets in the Soviet Union -- was clearly undertaken in circumvention of the treaty.

Gul: Our press wrote that the deployment in Europe of the new U.S. missiles was an outflanking maneuver on the part of the United States that was a breach of SALT II. Yet, the Americans have claimed that they sited these missiles in retaliation to the Soviet Union's deployment of SS-20 missiles. It would be nice to clear this up once and for all.

Dadyants: You mean explain why the Soviet Union's deployment of the SS-20 missiles to which the U.S. Administration is referring in its attempts to justify the deployment of the Pershing and cruise missiles was not a violation of SALT II, whereas the deployment of the U.S. missiles is a violation? Well, the reason is very simple: The Soviet SS-20 missiles cannot reach U.S. territory and therefore are not a strategic weapon in respect to the United States, while the U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles can reach Soviet territory and consequently are a strategic weapon where the USSR is concerned. Not to see this fundamental difference is to ignore the geographical position of the USSR and the United States.

Although the deployment of the Pershing-2 and cruise missiles was in fact a violation of SALT II, the USSR did, with a view to facilitating the quest for acceptable solutions, agree to regard these missiles as "medium-range" missiles and to discuss them separately. I would like to mention that in his 15 January statement, M.S. Gorbachev proposed that in addition to the 50 percent reduction of the Soviet and U.S. strategic potential, all medium-range missiles in Europe, both Soviet and American, be removed. We went even further to accommodate the West by agreeing that British and French nuclear weapons could be left off the Soviet-American "balance sheet." Yet these weapons are also targeted on our country. As you can see, we are making concessions to the West in an effort to find ways toward an agreement, but Washington and its NATO allies are, unfortunately, constantly blocking these measures.

Gul: At the NATO foreign ministers' session in Canada the U.S. NATO allies expressed disagreement with President Reagan's decision to violate SALT II. To what extent were their protests sincere?

Dadyants: In my opinion, it is not important now how sincere these protests were but, rather, how effective they will be.

True, U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz found himself "utterly isolated" in Canada. Without exception, all the U.S. NATO allies opposed the U.S. intention to torpedo such an important mechanism for containing the nuclear arms race as SALT II. However, matters are not going beyond protests. None of the U.S. allies asked, for instance, as a sign of protest against the steps of the U.S. Administration, to have the Pershing and cruise missiles removed from Europe. Furthermore, British nuclear submarines are to be equipped with U.S. Trident systems -- a strategic weapon -- that the United States is placing in British hands. Nor should one entertain any illusions concerning France, which claims the "independence" of its nuclear forces. Personally, I take a skeptical view of the "rebellion on knees" stated by the U.S. NATO allies against the R. Reagan administration's intention to violate SALT II. Using a sporting metaphor, they are denouncing the United States for breaking the rules of the game too blatantly, but they nonetheless still "support" the U.S. team.

Gul: What specific measures will the Soviet Union adopt in response to the violation of SALT II by the United States? Why, despite the meeting in Geneva, is the U.S. side behaving so provocatively in the international arena? Will a new Soviet-American summit be held in view of the U.S. violation of its obligations?

Dadyants: Well, first, SALT II has yet to be violated (R. Reagan has scheduled the U.S. "exit" from the treaty for the end of the current year). It is possible that the numerous protests both in Europe and in the United States itself will induce President Reagan to look before he leaps (our press cited many utterances by prominent U.S. politicians critical of the stance adopted by the administration (regarding the treaty). However, if the treaty is violated, we will, of course, adopt the appropriate measures to strengthen our security. As the Soviet leadership has emphasized on more than one occasion, we will not allow the Americans to disrupt the military strategic parity. In other words, we will pay them back in their own coin.

At present, of course, it is not just the purely military aspect but also the political aspect of the matter that is of concern. It is not only a question of SALT II but rather of the whole range of Soviet-American relations. The United States does not want to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions and is conducting one new test after another in Nevada. It occupies an unconstructive position at the aforementioned talks

on nuclear and space arms in Geneva, and it is fueling anti-Soviet hysteria. Even the tragedy at the Chernobyl AES was exploited to exacerbate the international atmosphere. The U.S. leaders' gambling on brute force, the nuclear fist, and terrorist brigandage in combination with ideological intolerance and hatred can only be explained by a total disregard for present realities. All this, as you correctly noted, casts doubts on the prospects for a new Soviet-American summit. "The legitimate question arises," M.S. Gorbachev said in his report to the CPSU Central Committee June (1986) Plenum, "whether Washington really wants a new meeting or whether all the talk about it is just an attempt to mislead world public opinion."

The press, including the Western press, is increasingly writing about the recklessness and irresponsibility of the policy of the present administration that puts the interests of its military-industrial elite above the interests of the world and even above the interests of the security of the U.S. people themselves. One foreign newspaper defined Reagan's policy as follows: "Apres moi le deluge" ["After me, the flood"]. I recall that these words are attributed to the French King Louis XV, whose court was notorious for its dissipation and extravagance. This dissipation and extravagance was followed by the great French bourgeois revolution, and Louis XV's successor, Louis XVI, lost his head on the guillotine. The present rulers of America will, of course, not be there forever, but what will they bequeath to their country and mankind as a whole? They are clearly working toward a "universal deluge" -- toward an all-embracing nuclear catastrophe.

It is the task of all people of goodwill, and that means you and me, to avert this catastrophe.

U.S. 'Crushing' Treaties

LD231738 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 23 Jun 86

["Maintain SALT Process and Strengthen Stability on Earth" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow 23 June TASS -- TASS Military News Analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Like an elephant in a china stop, the U.S. Administration continues to crush one after another the agreements, reached in the sixties-seventies, on reducing the risk of nuclear war. By abandoning the 1972 interim agreement [SALT I] and the SALT-2 treaty and by putting in jeopardy through its actions the agreements on the limitation of ABM systems, on the principles governing the activities of countries in outer space, and a number of other accords, Washington delivers a blow on the very idea of curbing the arms race through negotiations and brings the world closer to the danger line beyond which full destabilisation of the military-political situation, fraught with the risk of a disastrous war, would begin.

Over five and a half years of the stay in office the present U.S. Administration has managed to derail more accords than the number of those remaining in force now. Washington seriously undermines its reputation of a negotiating partner and throws doubt upon readiness to observe the last remaining partial test ban treaty and the treaty on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. The U.S. actions confirm the earlier existing serious misgivings as to whether the U.S. side wants any new agreements altogether.

The SALT-2 treaty became the result of a reasonable compromise agreed upon by the sides. Striving to ensure real barriers to a nuclear arms build-up, the USSR went to meet the U.S. side over a number of questions in 1979. In particular, after ratifying the SALT-2 treaty the Soviet side was to reduce the number of its strategic delivery vehicles by ten percent. U.S. specialists highly appreciated the SALT-2 provisions for the limitation of the number of warheads on ballistic missiles, the so-called rules for counting MIRVed missiles and on banning interfering with the functioning surveillance satellites and on limiting the number of heavy ICBMs. The Pentagon's report for the 1981 fiscal year pointed out that the USA should admit that the SALT-2 for a number of reasons was meeting U.S. interests.

The USSR was scrupulously fulfilling all its obligations under the concluded treaties, including SALT-1 and SALT-2. Nonetheless Washington decided to abandon further adherence to the treaties. What are the causes of this decision of the Reagan administration? The point is that the strategic arms limitation agreements are based on the principle of U.S. plans aimed at achieving military superiority. Washington decided to sacrifice the security interests of its own people in order to try to wear out the Soviet Union economically, to weaken the influence of the socialist camp upon the cause of peace and social progress, and to regain the U.S. lost positions. These calculations are built on sand.

The U.S. military-political elite and its adventuristic conduct in the world arena pose an unprecedented threat to peace on earth and to the security of the United States itself. The arms race brings in huge profits to monopolies and to the military industrial complex. Herein is one of the main cause of the piling up of new and new U.S. systems for mass annihilation. The U.S. actions to upset the established rough parity are sure to give rise to appropriate counteraction on the part of the Soviet side. The USSR will not allow a U.S. nuclear-missile superiority.

Coming forward with new peace initiatives, which have been supported by the world public, the Soviet Union hopes that the United States Government will weigh once again the measure of responsibility it assumes by taking a decision leading to a break-up of the SALT process, and will draw appropriate conclusions while there is still time.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1437

SALT/START ISSUES

PRC PEOPLE'S DAILY VIEWS 'STORM' OVER SALT ISSUES

HK150342 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO in Chinese 14 Jun 86 p 6

["Roundup" by Zhang Liang: "The Storm Around SALT"]

[Text] A new storm has arisen between Washington and Moscow in the past few weeks. This was touched off by the U.S. decision no longer to adhere to SALT-II. This development has without doubt cast a shadow over the U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks at Geneva and has also increased the tension in relations between the two countries. This American intention was announced by President Reagan in a statement on 27 May. Reagan said that in the future the United States must decide on the structure of its strategic forces in light of the degree of the threat posed by the Soviet strategic forces, and would no longer be bound by the SALT. The reason for this was that the Soviet Union had violated this treaty. However, his words left some room for maneuver, in that he expressed the hope that the Soviet Union would make use of this period to take constructive measures to stop violating the treaty; in that case, the United States would reconsider the matter.

The Soviet Union promptly reacted strongly to this American announcement. It denounced it as "an attempt to wreck the military balance," and warned that the Soviet Union "would not be unconcerned" over this move. If the United States failed to adhere to the treaty provisions, this might make the second U.S.-Soviet summit scheduled for this year fizzle out.

This expression of attitude by the U.S. Government caused serious disquiet in America and also among the Western allies. Now, when there has been no progress at all in the U.S.-Soviet arms control talks, the official U.S. announcement that it will no longer adhere to SALT-II will undoubtedly whip up a new round of the nuclear arms race. According to reports, the majority of congressmen do not agree with the government's decision, and some of them have even made plans for legislative moves to force the Reagan administration to continue to adhere to the treaty. At the recent conference of NATO foreign ministers, the foreign ministers of various countries put pressure on the United States by appealing to it not to abandon SALT-II. In the face of these pressures, President Reagan defended and explained his administration's decision at his 11 June press conference, to reassure the country and the Western allies. Reagan stated that if the Soviet Union could take the correct action, he might retract his decision to break through the SALT restrictions.

The U.S.-Soviet SALT was signed in 1979 during the administration of President Carter. After the treaty was signed, there were always differing views on it in the United States, and later the treaty was shelved by Congress and has never been ratified, due to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The Reagan administration has always taken a

negative attitude toward the treaty since it came to power. Due, however, to various domestic and external factors, Reagan has guaranteed that "so long as the Soviet Union displays corresonding restraint, we will not violate the existing arms control agreements."

However, the United States and the Soviet Union have constantly bickered and accused each other of violating the treaty over the past 7 years. In the recent period of time, Reagan submitted a detailed report to Congress listing Soviet treaty violations, and in particular accusing the Soviet Union of having produced and deployed new type-2 SS-25 intercontinental missiles, building a new radar station in Siberia, continuing to use secret code in missile testing with the aim of hampering verification, and so on. For its part, the Soviet Union has denied this and has in turn accused the United States of breaking the treaty provisions on many occasions, such as by exceeding the stipulated number of multiwarhead missiles, building missile-launching silos on land above the stipulated number, deploying Pershing-II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, and so on.

However, there are other reasons why Reagan chose the present moment to threaten to scrap the treaty. According to analysis by foreign press and publications, the United States may have taken three aspects into account. First, it wants to influence the U.S.-Soviet arms control talks at Geneva. Since they were resumed last year, these talks have now gone to the fifth round, but they have still not entered the phase of substantive "bargaining," and there is not much chance of an agreement being reached in the near future. The United States hopes that a realistic plan for reducing nuclear armaments can be discussed as soon as possible. Second, U.S. midterm elections are due in November, and Reagan needs to take a hardline attitude to reassure the right-wing conservatives. The United States plans to deploy a number of new B-52 bombers carrying cruise missiles before the end of the year; when that happens, the total number of U.S. multiwarhead missiles and aircraft will exceed the 1,320 limit set by the treaty. U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger said quite openly that this is for the purpose of reviving a "modern and effective deterrent force," to counter Soviet superiority in land-based missiles.

SALT-II was signed when there was parity between U.S. and Soviet nuclear forces. It is an agreement that seeks upward balance, and there are also many ambiguities in the text that give the two sides room for maneuver in continuing to develop their nuclear forces. The United States holds that the treaty provisions regarding multiwarhead missiles favor the Soviet Union, and that the Soviet Union has taken advantage of this loophole in the treaty to greatly develop its nuclear forces in recent years. The United States has therefore harbored the notion of changing the restriction on the number of carrier vehicles to a restriction on the number of warheads, so as to alter this aspect which is unfavorable for the United States. U.S. talks of scrapping the treaty also more or less reflects this U.S. thinking.

The current storm between the United States and the Soviet Union centered on whether to continue adhering to SALT-II also shows that there has been no relaxation in the positions of the two sides regarding disarmament. The Soviet Union has recently displayed some kind of "flexibility" while launching a vigorous "peace" offensive under the premise of making no substantial concessions. The aim of these Soviet proposals remains to pressure the United States into abandoning its "star wars" scheme, while the United States for its part seeks to force the Soviet Union to make a big reduction in its land-based intercontinental missiles. Hence, although one disarmament proposal after another has seen the light of day, not even minimal progress has ever been made at the Geneva disarmament talks. These proposals have turned into blank rounds. What now worries people in the West is that if the treaty is indeed dismantled, there will not even be a superficial restriction on the U.S.-Soviet arms race, and it is hard to predict what kind of a situation this will produce. The antogonism between the two countries will also increase.

/8309
CSO: 5200/4043

BRIEFS

TASS ON MINUTEMAN-3 TEST--Washington, 15 Jun (TASS)--The Pentagon today conducted another test of the inter-continental ballistic missile Minuteman-3. The missle that was launched from the U.S. airbase Vandenberg, California, hit the target situated at a distance of 6,720 kilometers south-west of the base. The UPI news agency noted that this launching was the 120th one in a series of test flights of U.S. inter-continental ballistic missiles conducted by the U.S. Airforce. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 15 Jun 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1437

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

FRG CDU/CSU 'DISAPPOINTED' WITH PACT PROPOSALS

Todenhoefer Expresses 'Disappointment'

LD111810 Hamburg DPA in German 1528 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 11 Jun (DPA) — Juergen Todenhoefer, disarmament policy spokesman of the CDU/CSU Bundestag group, expressed disappointment in Bonn today with the Warsaw Pact disarmament proposals. In a statement Todenhoefer did announce that the CDU/CSU will examine the proposals, but he also regretted that they fell far short of the expectations aroused by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev.

The East's proposals show that the Warsaw Pact wants to turn its conventional superiority into an accepted fact. In terms of figures this means 56,000 battle tanks against 16,000 NATO tanks, 7,000 artillery pieces and missile launchers against NATO's 3,060, and 7,000 tactical combat aircraft against 3,500.

Genscher's Remarks

LD121229 Hamburg DPA in German 1112 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 12 Jun (DPA) — Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher describes the statement by the Warsaw Pact states as a "reaction to be welcomed" in light of the NATO decisions made in Halifax.

NATO member states meeting in Halifax at the end of May, presented a concept for comprehensive cooperation between West and East. The call by the communist countries to deepen political dialogue with the West is an "encouraging sign" for U.S.-Soviet dialogue, Genscher said today, part of which is a new summit meeting with Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, which U.S. President Ronald Reagan favors.

Genscher said that the readiness of the Warsaw Pact to cooperate in the fight against terrorism and also in the field of reactor security (?deserves) attention. [passage indistinct] The Federal Government welcomes all steps which reduce the existing imbalance and lead to real stability.

striking forces. However, such far-reaching offers should be fully considered in the experts' negotiations. NATO has outlined its will to deal with disarmament in the conventional field more than ever before — if the framework conditions are positive.

The Essen *WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG* writes the following, headlined, Prepared for a Dialogue: As expected, the Budapest Warsaw Pact summit meeting has reiterated Gorbachev's proposal outlined at the Berlin SED Congress to reduce conventional armed forces from the Atlantic to the Urals. But what makes the Budapest summit's concrete proposals particularly interesting is the offer of effective on-the-spot verification, to which the Soviet Union has been so much opposed in the past. This could be an important key to movement at the Vienna MBFR negotiations, which have been stalemated for a long time.

The Mainz *ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG* asks: What is tactics and what is the substance of the Warsaw Pact's new declaration of intent? The newspaper goes on to say: The Soviets can face the test, not in another conference at some other place, but at the old Vienna conference table, where troop reductions in Europe have been discussed for 13 years. They can prove there whether they really want to disarm, or whether they just want to bring their military superiority down to a lower level. They should specify there what they really want to accept regarding verification.

DIE WELT maintains: A first assessment of the new Warsaw Pact summit proposals in Budapest regarding disarmament in Europe shows that the East has obviously just added new proposals to many old ones, the implementation of which does not match its propaganda effect. It seems that Gorbachev again demonstrated the old Soviet method, which it has tested for years, of creating new hopes in the West with a new arms control proposal. But whenever real negotiations between experts from both camps take place, it turns out — as in the long drawn-out efforts in Vienna, Geneva, and Stockholm — that the Soviets do not really want to disarm. Gorbachev is thus following the tradition of Soviet policy to bring influence to bear on the West. The reputation he had when he took over, of wanting to embark a new foreign policy of real understanding with the West, has definitely been weakened.

Vogel Welcomes Proposals

LD121312 Hamburg DPA in German 1226 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Munich, 12 Jun (DPA) — SPD Bundestag group Chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel welcomes the Budapest Warsaw Pact proposals as being "in the right direction." "I will make sure that they are examined," Vogel told the press today on the sidelines of a conference of SPD regional and national parliamentary group chairmen in Munich. The proposals contain constructive elements. He warned that the West should not lay them aside after only a few days. I can not understand, the SPD politician continued, why some people in the West find it depressing when such disarmament initiatives come from the East.

Press on Disarmament Proposals

DW121116 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 505 GMT [as printed] 12 Jun 86

[From the Press Review]

[Excerpts] Some editorials discuss the recent disarmament proposals made to NATO by the East.

The Freiburg *BADISCHE ZEITUNG* writes: The Warsaw Pact leaders have uttered great words. They propose that East and West should disarm up to 150,000 men, each in a relitavely short time — while simultaneously the Vienna negotiations on troop reductions in Europe deal with a moderate figure of between 5,000 and 12,000 men. Are there two rival Moscow power centers at work, or is this strange discrepancy caused by the clumsy Soviet foreign service? The Budapest offer by the Eastern camp is at any rate interesting. It takes Western considerations into account that in case of clear-cut use of nuclear weapons the USSR could exploit its superior conventional

/8309
CSO: 5200/2706

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S BOVIN: U.S. ACTIONS INTENDED 'TO BLOCK SUMMIT MEETING'

PM231945 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 86 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA Political Observer A. Bovin article: "Beyond Mars"]

[Text] THE WASHINGTON POST recently cited a curious observation by Paul Brown, head of the arms control program at Livermore Laboratory (one of the U.S. laboratories where nuclear weapons are developed and improved). Brown, as is the rule for those Americans who, under the current President, are engaged in "arms control," is against such control. Understandably he is also against an accord on the total prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. As a specialist, Brown knows that existing apparatus makes it possible to precisely establish possible violations of such an accord. But this is on Earth. But who and what is there to prevent the Soviet Union from taking testing in "deep space"? No one and nothing. Therefore, Brown thinks, the cunning Russians "can conduct tests in space beyond Mars and in this event we would have to fly there in order to determine the yield of the explosion." Getting into space "beyond Mars" is no easy matter. Consequently it is better to leave everything as it is and not ban tests but continue them. Here, on Earth, of course... Exquisite logic. If it is made the foundation of U.S. stances, it is perfectly possible to imagine the following turn of events. Let us suppose that in the desire to reach an agreement on strategic arms limitation, we were to agree on any form of monitoring [kontrol]. Let the Americans set just 10 monitors on each of our missiles. The answer is not difficult to foresee. "No," they will tell us once again. "No," because who knows if those Russians have not already deployed their missiles on Pluto or, what is considerably closer and easier, on Uranus.

Let us be serious. If we come back to Earth from space, it is impossible to get rid of the idea that the U.S. Administration is ready to dream up whatever it likes, and to allude to whatever it sees fit, and to do what it pleases simply to prevent the reapprochement of Soviet and American viewpoints, to make mutual understanding between the USSR and the United States more difficult if only in order to entrench itself in cold war and confrontation more deeply and more thoroughly.

Welcoming R. Reagan's assertiveness and firmness and the toughening of his policy since Geneva 1985, the conservative American organization called the Heritage Foundation compiled a list of glorous -- in its opinion -- deeds performed by the President. .
I shall enumerate them:
The bombing of Libya.
The new requests for appropriations for financing the Nicaraguan "contras."
Aid to Jonas Savimbi, leader of the Angolan rebels.
The granting of Stinger antiaircraft missiles to the Afghan dushmans.
The demand for a sharp cutback in the number of Soviet diplomats accredited at the United Nations.

The refusal to make concessions at the Geneva talks on arms control.
The refusal to introduce a moratorium on nuclear tests.
The statement on SALT I and SALT II.
That is the picture.

Recently, naturally, the attention of the U.S. and world public has been concentrated around the actual refusal of the U.S. President to observe the limitations contained in SALT I and SALT II. The allies are displeased and irritated. Congress is seething. U.S. journalists are writing about the "total isolation" of the President and are calling his decisions "absurd."

In order to stifle the critical voices if only to some degree, and to remove the sensation of the patent provocativeness and unconstructiveness of his policy, the President, speaking last week at Glassboro, called for people to act for the sake of peace and spoke with emphasis about a desire to reach agreement with the Soviet Union and to embark on a radical reduction of armaments, and so on and so forth. This hypocritical collection is well known to us. We have heard it in various versions and in different combinations. But it is preferable to take as a reference point not words, even pleasant ones. It is preferable to orient oneself toward deeds. But as far as deeds are concerned, they are enumerated above. If each of them is taken separately, in isolation, one could say that the President was mistaken, gave way to emotion, and overestimated America's potential. Anything can happen... However, taken as a whole, the list, which was conscientiously compiled by the President's friends, leaves no room for such arguments. We have before us a well thought-out political line. A line toward the worsening of Soviet-American relations, spurring on the arms race, and exacerbating international tension. I may be mistaken, but I form the impression that the White House has decided, come what may, to block a new summit meeting. Provided, of course, one does not have in mind a meeting "beyond Mars"....

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW VIEWS SHIFTING U.S. RESPONSE TO SOVIET INITIATIVES

LD191957 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Jun 86

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] In many foreign responses on the new Soviet 5-year plan it is noted that our large-scale plans are indisolubly bound with the kind of foreign policy aimed at peaceful construction and at all-round international cooperation. It is true that if one of the most important characteristics of our plan is the speeding up of the country's socio-economic development, then for the USSR's foreign policy at the current stage a distinctive dynamism is inherent.

It is sufficient to list our major peace initiatives in recent times: the presentation of a concrete plan for full nuclear disarmament and the continuation for another 6 months of the unlilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions; a draft agreement to eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and the new proposal in Geneva to limit strategic offensive arms; a complete program, agreed with other socialist countries, to cut armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe; and the USSR's new initiatives to eliminate chemical weapons and to prevent the militarization of space.

It is not surprising that in the West they are beginning to speak of the new peace offensive of the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist community. Willy Brandt, chairman of Socialist International, points out that the East has again, as it has so often done in recent times, grasped the initiative for a public discussion of the possibility of limiting arms.

What is the West, and primarily the United States, doing at the same time? Their present policy can well be called the policy of refusal: refusal to end nuclear tests, refusal to recognize existing accords on strategic arms, refusal to leave space free of weapons. True, taking into account the public mood, it seems that Western capitals, including Washington, are no longer taking the risk of repeating in all possible ways only the word "no". The governments of several West European countries have positively appraised the Budapest appeal of the Warsaw Pact states. Even in the White House this time they did not, as they usually do, reject the Soviet proposals immediately, but promised to study them seriously. In this connection, the U.S. press itself writes that Washington's administration is torn by contradictions on the question of the new Soviet proposals. Well, as the saying goes, we live and learn, but in either case, as it was stressed both at the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and at the USSR Supreme Soviet we shall continue to do in future everything possible for the preservation and strengthening of peace.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: U.S. CONSIDERS 'INSERTABLE NUCLEAR COMPONENTS'

LD160917 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT 16 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 16 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

The United States intends to replenish its nuclear arsenal with new weapons.

As is reported by the newspaper "WASHINGTON POST", "the Reagan administration is considering development of weapons that could be transformed from conventional to nuclear".

Almost any type of weapon can be developed to accommodate what the military calls "insertable nuclear components", according to designers at the Lawerence Livermore National Laboratory, engaged in research in that field. The likeliest application would be to tactical weapons, such as Navy torpedoes or short-range Army missiles.

Development of such weapons would "create an arms control nightmare", "WASHINGTON POST" points out.

William M. Arkin, a nuclear weapons expert and administration critic at the Institute for Policy Studies, said that convertible weapons would make nuclear war more likely.

The U.S. Government, said prominent American expert Paul C. Warnke, should strive for eliminating tactical nuclear armaments but not for creating new types of these armaments.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REPORTS ON PUGWASH GENEVA MEETING

Meeting Opens

LD140955 Moscow TASS in English 0834 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 14 TASS -- An international Pugwash meeting which has opened here is devoted to the discussion of the most vitally important issue of today -- the problem of nuclear and space arms. The participants in the meeting will discuss the need to observe the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty and to end underground nuclear test, the problem of averting the threat of nuclear war, possibilities for reducing strategic arms and far-reaching agreements on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe as well as other problems. The attention of those present at the meeting is focused on the address by the Warsaw Treaty member-countries to NATO member-states [word indistinct] to all European countries with a programme to reduce the armed forces and conventional arms in Europe.

The two-day meeting is being attended by prominent scientists, public figures and experts on military affairs from many countries.

Urges Observance of SALT II

LD170513 Moscow TASS in English 0114 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 16 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Shishlo reports:

The existing arms control agreements, although not perfect, still ensured a possibility of curbing the arms race to some extent, says a statement of the Executive Committee of the Pugwash Movement published today. It was adopted on the results of the Pugwash meeting of scientists, public figures and experts on military problems from 18 countries held here.

The participants in the meeting came to the conclusion that although the SALT-2 treaty was not ratified, it was observed in its main parametres.

The turning down of the observance of the treaty can lead to the upsetting of the balance of forces, to the growth of expenditures on the arms race and to a greater danger of the outbreak of a war.

This is why it is necessary to observe the SALT-2 treaty until it is replaced by corresponding agreements on a more large-scale reduction of strategic armaments.

It is also important to observe the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) treaty in order to prevent a further stepping up of the arms race, the statement continues.

In addition to the observance of the SALT-2 and ABM treaties, the arms control regime should be consolidated through a ban on the testing and deployment of anti-satellite weapons and on nuclear explosions and through achieving a mutual reduction of conventional armaments in Europe.

The participants in the meeting emphasized that the only way to rid the world of the danger of a nuclear war was to eliminate nuclear weapons.

Speaking at a press conference, the participants in the meeting from the USSR, the U.S., Britain and Italy pointed out the need for the early reaching of agreements on nuclear and space weapons with a view to putting an end to the arms race and warding off the nuclear war threat.

Touching upon the problem of the observance of the SALT-2 treaty, Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, head of a department of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, pointed out that at the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states held in Budapest the socialist countries had stated that they would strictly observe the existing treaties and arms control agreements and had urged the NATO countries to follow this example.

Karpov Meets Leaders

LD172045 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 17 TASS -- Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation to the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments, met here today with Dr Martin Kaplan, general secretary of the International Pugwash Movement, and Professor Bernard Feld, chairman of the movement's executive committee.

The Soviet side set out the USSR's principled approach to arms control problems, directed at preventing an arms in outer space, ending it on earth and eliminating all nuclear weapons by the turn of the century. It was shown that the USSR's practical proposals at the talks ensured everything necessary for the earliest reaching of effective mutually acceptable agreements in this field. On their part, the representatives of the Pugwash movement highly assessed the Soviet Union's positive steps directed at averting the nuclear threat and strenghtening universal security. They pointed to the great importance of the USSR's unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: WORLD PEACE COUNCIL ON UN DISARMAMENT-DEVELOPMENT FORUM

LD091610 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Text] Helsinki June 9 TASS -- The World Peace Council issued today the following statement: "On the United Nations Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development."

The World Peace Council and the national movements represented in it from over 140 countries of all continents are deeply concerned at the efforts being made by certain governments to postpone the convening of the United Nations Conference on the Relationship Between Disarmament and Development, which is scheduled to open in Paris on July 15, 1986.

The Government of the United States of America, after declaring that it would not participate in the conference, has been pressing other governments to join it in acting to prevent the conference from taking place. It is now reported that the new French Government -- the government of the host country -- is demanding a "postponement" of the conference on the utterly false plea that preparations for the conference are inadequate.

The United Nations decision to convene this conference on the relationship between two key issues facing all humanity, was warmly welcomed and supported by governments and world public opinion. Preparations have been continuing on all continents. Non-governmental organisations have joined the member states of the United Nations in holding numerous preparatory events for the Paris conference. Numerous studies and documents are ready for discussion. The perilous arms build-up has reached new heights in recent weeks -- with the U.S. announcement of its decision to violate SALT II, with the NATO agreement for the speeding up of production of sophisticated chemical weapons by Washington, with the intensification of the U.S. "star wars" preparations and the carrying out of several U.S. nuclear weapon tests in Nevada.

The problems facing scores of developing countries -- famine, hunger, poverty, and external debt -- have been highlighted at the special session of the U.N. General Assembly on the crisis in Africa. Never was the need greater than today for multilateral discussions and negotiations on the relationship between disarmament and development.

The World Peace Council urges all peace and anti-war movements, all non-governmental organisations which stand for a world without nuclear weapons, without hunger and poverty -- to join hands to urge the United Nations to hold this conference on the relationship between disarmament and development without delay.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW RELIGIOUS ROUND TABLE ON ARMS RACE, POVERTY

PM300855 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 86 Morning Edition p 4

[V. Kondrashov report: "Call to Action"]

[Text] A roundtable conference on problems of combating hunger, poverty, and the arms race organized by the working presidium of the World Conference of Religious Leaders has ended in Moscow. Taking part in the round table were 70 religious leaders, as well as well known experts from nearly 30 countries. All the planet's continents were represented here, and all the world's main religions -- Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Judaism, Islam.

Pimen, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, sent a message of greetings to the participants in the conference, which was chaired by Pavel mar Grigoriy metropolitan of Delhi and Northern India. "It is the inhuman, immoral policy of preserving and even stepping up the nuclear arms race, the policy of militarization of outer space," he stressed, "which lead to the growth of poverty and hunger among broad strata of the population of many states."

The religious leaders and experts discussed the latest information about the interconnection between the arms race, on the one hand, and hunger and poverty on the other, and examined the problems of countries which are in acute need of peaceful economic development, in which they could be helped considerably by the resources which are now spent on the production of weapons of mass destruction.

In a communique adopted unanimously on the last day of the meeting, the participants in the roundtable conference expressed their concern at a whole series of new acts of aggression: The United States against Libya; South Africa against Zimbabwe, Botswana, and against Angola. "The white minority regime in South Africa," the communique notes, "is following the example of its 'historical ally' -- the United States."

The participants in the Moscow meeting expressed their sympathy for the families of those killed as a result of the Chernobyl AES accident, and also expressed regret that "certain circles are spreading lies in the mass media and utilizing the accident for the purpose of cheap political propaganda."

The communique points out that the participants in the roundtable sent letters to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, U.S. President R. Reagan, and the leaders of the six states -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania.

"Man must serve the ideas of peace," Moulavi Gulyam Sarvar Mansur, a prominent religious leader from Afghanistan and representative of the DRA Supreme Council of Theologians and Religious Leaders, stated in a talk with IZVESTIYA's correspondent. "American imperialism is a threat to peace, stalking the world like a hungry jackal in pursuit of profit. The United States uses the most modern types of weapons to achieve its base objectives and suppress the peoples' striving for freedom. It is trying to stifle the Afghan people's freedom too and to divert our material resources from the tasks mapped out by the revolution. But the Afghan people are not alone in their struggle against the forces of counterrevolution and imperialism. We are grateful for the help which the Soviet Union gives us. Here at the roundtable conference we have seen once again the humanism of Soveit foreign policy evokes the sincere respect of the world public, including religious circles."

"I am very pleased with the work of the roundtable conference," the well-known Greek public figure General Yeoryios Koumankakos, retired, who was at the meeting as an expert, stated "It showed that the ranks of those who fight against the arms race and for peace and the peoples' prosperity are swelling. I am profoundly convinced that the Soviet Union's position on disarmament questions is a positive factor in the attainment of these goals. We fully approved M.S. Gorbachev's statement on the Soviet Union's decision to extend the nuclear test moratorium until 6 August. This is further evidence of the USSR's courage and nobility in its approach to the vital issues disturbing mankind. It gives new strength to all who value the cause of peace."

A delegation of prominent representatives of the roundtable conference headed by Metropolitan Filaret of Minsk and Belorussia was received at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

TASS REPORTS ON SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS IN LIMA

CPSU Greetings

LD221455 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1125 GMT 22 Jun 86

[Greetings message from the CPSU Central Committee to the 17th Congress of the Socialist International]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Jun (TASS) -- Esteemed delegates! Your congress is discussing problems on whose solution the future of mankind depends.

The danger of a nuclear disaster hangs over the world community like a threatening shadow. Today it is a question of the survival of civilization -- perhaps the only civilization in the universe.

In October 1985, the Socialist International called on the United States and the Soviet Union to do everything possible to achieve a change of direction away from the policy of armament and toward a course aimed at preserving life on earth in conditions of peace, freedom, and respect for human dignity.

As you undoubtedly know, since then the Soviet Union has taken a number of major steps toward facilitating and accelerating that change of direction.

We have extended until 6 August 1986 our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions and have proposed reaching an urgent agreement to ban nuclear tests;

In our declaration of 15 January, we set out a clear and concrete plan to abolish nuclear and other mass-destruction weapons by the end of the present century and to reduce other armaments to the limits of rational adequacy [razumnaya dostatochnost];

We have put forward appropriate proposals for abolishing Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and also operational and tactical nuclear armaments, in view of the alarm also felt by Europeans;

We have put forward compromise proposals, meeting the West halfway, at the talks in Vienna and Stockholm and also at the disarmament conference in Geneva -- in the section dealing with banning and destroying chemical weapons as soon as possible under strict international control;

The Soviet Union has with the utmost clarity expressed its advocacy of effective control in all aspects of arms limitation, including international forms of verification, right up to on-site inspections.

All these initiatives are directed toward realizing the program put forward by the 27th CPSU Congress on creating an all-embracing system of international security.

The Warsaw Pact member-states recently presented to the NATO member-states and all European countries a comprehensive program on reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

With goodwill on the part of the United States, the reversal from increasing armaments to limiting and reducing them would be completely possible.

The USSR-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva engendered hope for an improvement in the international situation. Unfortunately, we have not met with a commensurate response, as you know, from the U.S. Administration, which is acting in contradiction to the letter and spirit of the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of 21 November 1985.

In the light of the U.S. Administration's refusal to join in the moratorium on nuclear tests and its announced intention to cease observing in the future the 1979 treaty on limiting strategic offensive weapons (SALT II), it is becoming wholly obvious that a course has been taken toward stepping up confrontation and toward an unlimited increase in armaments and the attainment of military superiority.

Claims by one state of the right to impose upon others its own will and its own "model" of development are impermissible. The policy of diktat and force can be fraught with the most grievous consequences for mankind.

The nuclear age requires a new way of thinking and a sober evaluation of the realities of the modern world, in which various sociopolitical systems and many dozens of states with their own legitimate interests exist -- a dynamic, changing, varied, and highly contradictory world.

Faced with problems applying to mankind in general, and above all with the problem of the survival of civlization, our world is becoming increasingly interdependent. The fact that no single state can bank any longer on defending itself soley through military-technical means is one of the realities of the nuclear age. Safeguarding security has become above all a political task, and this task must be accomplished through political means.

The road to national security is to be found through mutual security and security for all. Proceeding from this fact, we call on all governments, parties, public organizations, and movements which are truly concerned with the prospect of peace on earth to act for the creation of a comprehensive system of international security.

Our proposals concerning the basic principles of such a system of security -- in the military, political, economic, and humanitarian spheres -- were put forward in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th congress. These principles could serve as the point of departure and framework for a direct and systematic dialogue between the leaders of the countries of the world community. By adhering to them it would be possible to achieve a situation in which peaceful coexistence could become a supreme, universal principle of interstate relations.

Aware of its historical responsibility as the ruling party of one of the nuclear powers, the CPSU considers the struggle to halt the arms race and to maintain and strengthen universal peace to be the main direction of its activity in the international arena. We are ready to energetically seek and actively exploit any, even the slimmest, chance to break the trend toward the increase of military danger.

Great importance is attached in the Soviet Union to collectively seeking a political settlement of existing conflict situations in Central America, in southern Africa and in the Near and Middle East. We resolutely condemn all forms of terrorism, including state terrorism.

Stopping the arms race and eliminating hotbeds of military danger means not only stopping the slide toward war but also freeing the resources necessary to solve economic and social problems -- including, it stands to reason, those of the developing countries -- to combat hunger, poverty, and diseases, and to maintain the natural environment in a condition fit for future generations to live in.

The Soviet leadership is aware of the fact that there is a long and hard struggle ahead. But we shall not swerve form the course mapped out even if someone wants to force us to "slam the door" [as received].

It is necessary without fail to win the battle against war. The growing support for the demands of peace and disarmament by the international public, the influence of which is these days acquiring particular importance, is a guarantee for success in this battle.

We therefore hold in high esteem the appropriate efforts of the Socialist International, an influential political force in the international arena. We also value the initiatives of the "Palme Commission," of the leaders of the "Delhi Six" countries, and of all who seek ways to stop confrontation and who strive to assist mutual understanding, dialogue, and negotiations. The search for paths toward peace is a task for everyone.

The United Nations Organization has declared 1986 International Peace Year. The best way to actually bring this about would be a complete halt in the immediate future of nuclear tests and the conclusion of an international agreement completely banning nuclear weapons tests.

Attention to nuclear issues has recently been enhanced. People are better aware of the abyss which will open if a nuclear war is unleashed upon mankind. There is also a growing understanding of the need to multiply efforts in the struggle against nuclear weapons tests and the struggle to eliminate these weapons, and the need to strengthen international conditions for the safe development of atomic power engineering.

We wish the congress success in its work.

The CPSU Central Committee.

Speakers Criticize Arms Race

LD231149 Moscow TASS in English 1112 GMT 23 Jun 86

[Text] Lima June 23 TASS -- Problems of safeguarding peace and curbing the arms race are high on the agenda of the 17th Congress of the Socialist International which is taking place in the Peruvian capital. Speakers criticize the intention of the White House to violate the Soviet-American SALT-2 treaty and stress that these actions of the U.S. Administration can lead to catastrophe.

Speaking on behalf of several socialist and social democratic parties of a number of countries, Kalevi Sorsa, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Finland and prime minister of the country, called for the establishment of a strategic balance in the world, for substantial cuts in the nuclear arms arsenals and against the plans to militarize space. The world has no confidence of the morrow because huge quantities of nuclear weapons have been stockpiled on earth.

There can be no winners in nuclear war: every antagonist will lose.

The first secretary of the French Socialist Party, Lionel Jospin, called for treaties to curb the arms race and stressed the need to establish nuclear weapon-free zone.

The participants in the forum passed a resolution on the problems of Latin America and Caribbean. One of the central elements of that document is the crisis which arose in Central America through the fault of the USA. The resolution denounces Reagan administration's policy of gross pressure towards Nicaragua as it can provoke a major armed conflict in Central America. The delegates to the congress of the Socialist International called against the conduct of military exercises with the participation of foreign troops in that region and for non-aggression treaties between Central American countries.

The resolution also voices solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Chile and Paraguay against the reactionary regimes in their countries and for the restoration of democracy. The participants in the forum also urged Britain immediately to begin talks with Argentina on the sovereignty of the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands.

Willi Brandt of West Germany was re-elected the chairman of the Socialist International and Pentti Vaeaenaenen its secretary general.

Congress Manifesto

LD241327 Moscow TASS in English 1259 GMT 24 Jun 86

[Text] Lima June 24 TASS -- The 17th Congress of the Socialist International has closed here with the adoption of a Lima Manifesto, which stresses the vital need of curbing the arms race and safeguarding world peace.

The halting of nuclear explosions and an eventual total nuclear test ban, the manifesto says, would be evidence that the nuclear-armed countries approach in all seriousness the problem of arms control. The U.S. Government, the document continues should at long last renounce nuclear testing. In addition, the talks with the USSR on a complete and universal nuclear test ban, interrupted by the USA and Britain in 1980, should be immediately resumed.

All the nuclear-armed countries should become involved in these talks.

The participants in the congress noted the great importance of unilateral and multilateral measures to strengthen peace and promote international detente, and of any steps aimed at limiting and reducing armaments and curbing the arms race as a whole.

The final document of the forum expresses grave worry over the U.S. plans to militarize outer space. Space should be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. The 1972 ABM Treaty between the USSR and the USA, the manifesto says, should be preserved and strengthened. It is necessary to prevent the deployment of such systems anywhere, on earth or in outer space. It is also vitally important to establish nuclear weapon-free zones in the world.

The document voices the need for a total ban on chemical weapons and for an end to their production and deployment.

Weapons of any type must not be improved but policy must because universal security cannot be guaranteed through the renovation and stockpiling of weaponry. Peace and disarmament are inviolable conditions of the development, freedom and very survival of mankind. Nuclear war, the manifesto says, would constitute a crime against humanity.

The Lima Manifesto attaches much importance to the economic problems of developing countries, which are a consequence of the crisis gripping the entire capitalist economy. The difficulties of the developing countries are aggravated by their foreign indebtedness and by unequal trade and economic relations with developed Western countries.

The participants in the forum called for a peaceful settlement of the crisis in Central America, for the just solution of the Namibian and Middle East problems, and for political solutions to conflicts in other parts of the world. They denounced the apartheid regime in South Africa and acts of repression unleased by the reactionary dictatorships in Chile and Paraguay.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR HOLD HIROSHIMA SYMPOSIUM

Worldwide Appeal

OW140527 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 13 Jun 86

[Vykhukhalev report]

[Text] An international symposium of physicians on the issue of preventing nuclear war was held in Hiroshima yesterday. Our Tokyo correspondent, Vykhukhalev, reports on the symposium:

The symposium was attended by more than 700 physicians including members of a delegation of IPPNW -- the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War -- cochaired by Soviet Academician Chazov and U.S. Professor Lown. Its slogan was "Let us survive together and let us not die!"

Hiroshima Mayor Araki, addressing the symposium, noted that the symposium, held at a time when humanity finds itself in the greatest crisis in history, is extremely significant.

He then said: A positive effort to solidify peace has never been needed so much as it is now. CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev recently made proposals for holding a USSR-U.S. summit in Hiroshima and for extending the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions through 6 August. The proposals demonstrate anew what great expectations mankind attaches to Hiroshima. It is believed that Hiroshima should play a special role in saving mankind from the danger of nuclear war, and that it can do so.

The symposium adopted an IPPNW, appeal from Hiroshima, which states: In view of the grave world situation, the IPPNW has decided to appeal from here, the city that was subjected to the world's first atomic bombing -- Hiroshima -- for heeding our diagnosis calling for an immediate moratorium on all nuclear explosions. A halt to nuclear testing is an effective, practical step toward a solution to the urgent tasks of abolishing mass lethal weapons. The IPPNW appeals from Hiroshima to all physicians, peoples and governments: Let us act now before it is too late!

Meanwhile, Prof Barnard Lown said in an interview: Our visit to Japan is very important for our movement. The nuclear age began right here. Nuclear weapons saw their first victims here in Hiroshima. People all over the world should be fully aware of the lesson of Hiroshima. It is believed that the IPPNW movement will expand and gain strength in Japan as it did in the United States and the Soviet Union.

Academician Yevgeniy Chazov said: It is hoped that our visit to Hiroshima will lead to revitalizing the IPPNW movement and to increased IPPNW membership, particularly in Japan. Seeing the result of nuclear war with their own eyes will help physicians all over the world to hate nuclear bombs. At the same time, it will primarily help bring nuclear testing to an end.

Tokyo Press Conference

LD151255 Moscow TASS in English 1031 GMT 14 Jun 86

[Text] Tokyo, Jun 14 TASS--Professor Bernard Lown (USA), co-chairman of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" (IPPNW) movement, has stated that nuclear weapons pose the greatest-ever threat to mankind. If they are used, medicine would prove powerless to help their victims or to rid the world's population of the consequences of a "nuclear winter." He said there was only one way to save civilization: to prevent a nuclear conflict. With this end in view it is essential, first of all, to end all nuclear tests. Mr Lown spoke here today at a press conference on the results of the trip to Japan by a widely-representative IPPNW delegation which was headed, together with Mr Lown, by academician Yevgeniy Chazov (USSR), co-chairman of the movement.

The U.S. scientist pointed out that the rests of nuclear weapons were whipping up the arms race and were opening the way for the production and deployment of new, more sophisticated systems of destruction. He positively assessed the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium until August 6 of this year, and emphasized that physicians of the world were demanding that the U.S. Administration join the initiative.

Mr Lown criticised the "star wars" programme which is being publicized by Washington as a certain shield which would be ostensibly capable of protecting the USA against nuclear threat. He said there could be no shield against nuclear weapons, and that all talk about that was neither more nor less than a dangerous illusion. The deployment of the so-called space defence systems would only increase the risk of outbreak of nuclear war. He said the USA could not afford to implement such a costly and senseless programme.

Professor Lown said America which could not feed 20 million of its citizens was too poor for that.

The participants in the press conference rejected the assertions being circulated in the west that the Soviet Union is allegedly concealing information on the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. Ian Maddocks (Australia) and Lars Engstedt (Sweden), vice-presidents of the IPPNW, said that at the last IPPNW congress in Cologne they had received exhaustive data from Soviet colleagues on what had happened in Chernobyl.

Statement by Lown, Chazov

OW151417 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0300 GMT 15 Jun 86

[Text] An international symposium of physicians has been held in Hiroshima at the proposal of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War [IPPNW]. Station reporter Vykhushakev reports:

More than 700 physicians from many countries attended the symposium, which adopted an appeal for immediately stopping all nuclear tests.

Lown, Harvard University professor, and Chazov, Soviet academician, both of whom are co-chairmen of the IPPNW, signed the appeal.

[Begin Lown recording in English] The visit to Japan is extraordinarily important for our movement because this is where the atomic age started. This is where the first [words indistinct] victims. [end recording]

Lown said: The visit to Japan is extraordinarily important for our movement because this is where the nuclear age started, and nuclear weapons claimed their first victims here. The people throughout the world should be fully aware of the lesson of Hiroshima. Professor Lown said: The Soviet view is very important. It has three times extended the time limits for unilaterally suspending nuclear tests.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

KARPOV SAID TO HEAD NEW USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY ARMS SECTION

AU171255 Paris AFP in English 1243 GMT 17 Jun 86

[Excerpt] Geneva, June 17 (AFP) -- Victor Karpov, 58, chief Soviet delegate at the superpower nuclear and space arms talks here, is to head a new Soviet Foreign Ministry section on "arms reduction and disarmament," a Soviet source said Tuesday.

The section would handle all current negotiations, covering both long-range strategic and medium-range missiles, and the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative -- "Star Wars" -- space defence project, the source added.

The Soviet ministry also apparently envisaged setting up a section to handle "nuclear and space cooperation," the source said.

It was not know if Mr. Karpov, an affable disarmament veteran, would leave Geneva. But it seemed possible he would continue to lead the Soviet negotiating team here.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

CSSR ACADEMICIAN ADDRESSES MOSCOW FORUM ON PEACE, ENVIRONMENT

LD282005 Prague CTK in English 1200 GMT 28 May 86

[Text] Moscow May 28 (CTK correspondent)--Josef Riman, president of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences and head of its delegation at the all-union conference of Soviet scientists opened here Tuesday, today addressed the conference with a speech on problems of peace and environmental protection.

In his address, Riman said all nations should unite their efforts to solve the serious economic and social problems of the developing countries, warning that the tendency towards a major social and economic crisis is likely to be accelerated in the future due to the poor stability of the global ecological system.

He also said most of the finances that could be used for solving global problems were being swallowed by continuing world armament.

"The earth' ecological system itself, already badly harmed, demands an immediate ban on any use of destructive weapons and further nuclear testing," he stressed.

Riman praised the Soviet peace proposals and criticized the United States, saying feverish armament and military aggression have become major features of its policy.

"The strategy of imperialism takes into account neither the objective social reality of today's world, nor the current ecological state of the earth," he stressed.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S PETROVSKIY ON FOREIGN MINISTRY RESHUFFLE, ARMS ISSUES

PM191136 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 17 Jun 86 p 12

[Interview with Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister V.F. Petrovskiy by Andrea Tarquini in Budapest; date not given]

[Text] Budapest -- "Due notice was issued of that major meeting at the ministry, so we experienced several days of expectation and waiting. For those at the start of their careers it was very exciting, while we oldsters, with so many postings and memories behind us, sought vainly through our records and recollections.

"Never before had a CPSU general secretary decided to address all us ambassadors in person. Not even Stalin during the war or following the victory." During a brief respite between a press conference and a meeting Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy was taking half an hour's rest, loosening his unseasonably warm blue suit. Sitting on a small sofa in a room at the Hilton, he examined me with his very lively dark eyes, while unenthusiastically sipping a tonic water (the new style demands certain sacrifices).

We heard from him -- one of Shevardnadze's most highly rated deputies -- about that agonizing reappraisal of diplomacy in what was (at least as far as we know) the first "secret report" delivered by Gorbachev.

"We heard vigorous criticisms and exhortations in his report and in the ensuing debate," Petrovskiy said in his strongly accented but excellent English. "Miknail Sergeyevich was determined to wage the battle begun at the congress within our ranks too. There was a single order, in two parts: We must formulate and pursue a foreign policy that will implement the pointers of the party congress, of which it will become and remain an integral and active part."

[Tarquini] Could you explain that better?

[Petrovskiy] I will try. The first requirement is that foreign policy meet the country's internal needs. At the congress Gorbachev launched a program of renewal and reforms. Therefore we strategists and ambassadors must no longer fall behind. The country must work harder and better. This must apply to us too. The rewards will go to those who are capable and creative, not to careerists and adherents to stereotypes. Well, this rule will apply to our own ranks and make itself felt. The USSR needs peace, dialogue, and economic cooperation to live a better life and to modernize itself. Very well, foreign policy, in all its aspects, must be not a curb to but a mainstay of and driving force behind this blueprint.

[Tarquini] A major reshuffle is under way in your ministry and all the major embassies. Basically this is the end of the Gromyko era....

[Petrovskiy] Yes, the impact is very great: I would say that the impact on the personal level is equal to that on the political level. The most important thing is the present political task and the pointers for us that will derive from it. We must work with the utmost efficiency for cooperation with all countries -- cooperation as the contrary of conflict. It is also natural that generations such as mine, which experienced the war and the fifties, should either strive to change or stand aside. But, I repeat, it is the political orientation that is the prime issue.

[Tarquini] Are you not also coming to terms with what we might call a problem of image? The seventies -- what with Angola, Kabul, and the SS-20's -- left us with an aggressive and militaristic image of the USSR....

[Petrovskiy] True, image making is one of the phenomena of politics. But images are not reality. They can help forge reality but they are only a secondary aspect of it. Now, however, in this shrinking world, rather than building another image, we are concerned with achieving things, establishing cooperation with everyone. The most important thing is to realize that we are all interdependent. I have in mind how we are all the prisoners of technologies and accidents...' you know, Chernobyl has taught us a great deal in this respect, has caused us to ponder the need for safety and the role of information. It has made us realize that we are all passengers on the same space shuttle or on a single aircraft.

[Tarquini] Yes, but will it be an interdependence between equals? Your parity with America seems to be faltering.

[Petrovskiy] Well, I would put it differently. Parity is not a demand, a claim: It derives from strategic, political, and all other kinds of realities. And we feel equal to them, both militarily and politically. In certain fields we may perhaps be behind them, but a basic parity exists.

The problem is a different one. By denying us parity, the Americans grow stronger with respect to both the allies and the Third World. This seems to me to be their aim.

[Tarquini] Even assuming this to be the case, their strategy could be a winning one. Consider the abandonment of SALT II. Does that not pose a problem for you?

[Petrovskiy] Yes, but we can only respond by maintaining positions of equality in all negotiating forums. If they tell us "no" so much the worse for them. We cannot do anything else, in any field. As for SALT, we still hope that Washington will reconsider. As long as they observe it, so will we.

[Tarquini] But a further process of rearmament will destroy your plans for reform....

[Petrovskiy] No. That is to say, it would be much easier to resolve our internal problems within a favorable, more relaxed international context.

Rearmament could have a negative impact on our reforms, but we will not be the ones to start it.

[Tarquini] One final question, Vladimir Fedorivich: When Gorbachev addressed KGB cadres do you believe he urged them on as he did you?

[Petrovskiy] Ha, ha. How can I answer you? That building which used to belong to Count Rostopchin is very fine, but I do not live there.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1436

END